A DEFENCE OF THE CHVRCHES AND MINISTERY OF ENGLANDE.

&

Written in two Treatiſes, againſt the Reaſons and Obiections of Maiſter *FRANCIS IOHNSON*, and *others of the ſeparation commonly called*

BROWNISTS.

Publiſhed, eſpecially, for the benefitt of thoſe in theſe partes of the lowe Countries.

MIDDELBVRGH,
By *Richard Schilders*, Printer to the States of Zealand.

1595.

A DEFENCE
OF THE CHVRCHES
AND MINISTERY
OF ENGLANDE.

Written in two Treatises, against the Reasons and Obiections of Maister FRANCIS IOHNSON, and others of the separation commonly called

BROWNISTS.

Published, especially, for the benefit of those in these parts of the lowe Countries.

MIDDELBVRGH,
By Richard Schilders, Printer to the States of Zealand.

1599.

THE PVBLISHER TO THE CHRISTIAN READER.

ABout Three Yeeres ſince, Maiſter Iacob hauing ſome ſpeach with certen of the ſeparation before mentioned, concerning their peremptory & vtter ſeparation frō the Churches of England, was requeſted by them, briefly to ſett down in wryting, his Reaſon for defence of the ſaid Churches, And they would either yeild vnto his prooſes, or procure an anſwer vnto the ſame. Wherevpon, the Argument following this Preface, was ſet downe in wryting by Maiſter Iacob: which the ſaid parties did ſend to Maiſter Fr. Iohnſon, being then priſoner in the Clinke in South wark, who made an anſwer vnto the ſame, conteyning 3. Exceptions and 9. Reaſons in denyall of the Aſſumption: Wherevnto Maiſter Iacob Replyed. Afterward Maiſter Iohnſon defended his ſaid Exceptions and Reaſons: And finally, Maiſter Iacob Replyed againe. As by the particulars themſelues appeareth.

Now hauing weighed and conſidered with my ſelfe, the great ignorance and errors, wherewith thoſe of the ſeparation aforeſaid, are and haue bene lately carried awaye: namely, to affirme, *That all that ſtande members of the Churches of Englande, are no true Chriſtians, nor in ſtate of ſaluation*, And ſuch like moſt vngodly ſentences, which would grieue any Chriſtian ſoule once to thinke on, much more to publiſh to the view of the world: And weighing likewiſe withall, the greate weakenes of manie Chriſtians among vs, who (through want of experience, or due conſideration of things as they are) may eaſelie by their deluſions be drawne away into thoſe errors with them: I haue therefore: (Aſwell in hope of reclaiming of the ſaid parties from their ſaid extremities, (which now I iudge the moſt of them, for want of meanes ſee not:) As alſo for the ſtaying of others from running into the ſame grieuous exceſſe with them) now publiſhed this diſcourſe to the view of the world, which hath line buryed in the hands of ſome few. Many being deſirous of it, who by reaſon of the largnes in wryting out of the ſame could not obteyne it: Wherevnto I am ſo much the rather induced, For that the Reaſons herein by Maiſter Iacob alleadged, haue (by Gods bleſſing) reclaymed many from their former errors, and ſatiſfied others, who haue bene doubtfull, and ſubiect to fall into the ſame.

In the examining of which Diſcourſe, I ſhall deſire the Reader to obſerue a few notes for his better proffiting in the ſame.

1. And Firſt, (among the reſt) to note this, as a token of the ſtrange and obſtinate dealing of Maiſter Iohnſon and others of them, viz. That heretofore, (vntill ſuch time as the Argument hereafter mentioned, was framed againſt them,) they neuer denyed, That the doctrine and profeſſion of the Churches of England, was ſufficient to make thoſe that beleeued and obeyed them, to be true Chriſtians, and in ſtate of ſaluation: But alwayes held, profeſſed and acknowledged the contrarie: As by the publike confeſſions of themſelues, namely Maiſter Barrow, Maiſter Penry, and Maiſter Iohnſon himſelfe, in this diſcourſe mentioned in Pag. 81. appeareth: But nowe, they ſeing, That if they ſhould acknowledge the ſaid Doctrines and profeſſion, to be ſufficient to ſaluation: That then this concluſion would of neceſſitie follow, *that thoſe that hold and practiſe the, are a true *Church*, And ſo their own former iudgements ſhould be croſſed. Rather I ſay then they would be drawne to that, They nowe ſtick not to deny their owne confeſſions (which they thinke to be the faireſt way for them,) and like vnnaturall children, ſo vehemently hate, contemne, and diſpiſe their mother who bare them, nouriſhed, and brought them vp: from whoſe breſts they ſucked that ſweete milke of the meanes of euerlaſting life and ſaluation, (if euer they had any taſt of it at all.) Beeing notwithſtanding, not abaſhed nowe in a deſperate manner, in the hardnes of their heart, to affirme: * *That none by the doctrine of the Churches of England, can be a true Chriſtian, or ſaued: But that they all worſhip God in vaine, Are aboliſhed from Chriſt, Are Babiloni. ans, Idolaters, departers from the faith, worſe then Infidels*; And ſuch like moſt vnchriſtian ſentences, making them all one with the Church of Rome, &c. Which impious affirmations, would cauſe any Chriſtian heart to lament and bleed for grief; Whoſe vnchriſtian ſentences, and falſe and deceiptfull Reaſons, (the very naming whereof were ſufficient to refute them,) are moſt plainly taken awaye, and cleane ouerthrowne, by theſe brief Replies of Maiſter Iacob vnto euery of them, vnto which I referre yow. Onely this I adde with all, which I would deſire might be noted: That if they continew in their former confeſſions, That the doctrines and profeſſion of the Churches of England are ſufficient to ſaluation; (As they ought, it being the very truth) Then are they all in a moſt grieuous ſchiſme, in ſo peremptorily condemning, and ſeparating, from ſuch true Chriſtians and Churches. And if they deny it: (as they haue begonne to doe:) Then doe they runne headlong, into an intollerable ſinne and extremitie, without all warrant of Gods word: And beſides giue iuſt occaſion to be called fearfull * Apoſtates, in ſo wholy falling (and that aduiſedly, for aduantage ſake, as it ſeemeth plainely to appeare) from ſo notable a truth which before they imbraced, and acknowledged.

* *Which yet Maiſter Penry confeſſed, ſee Pag. 22.*

* *Which appeareth, generally by denying the Aſſumption of Ma. Iacobs, & particularly in theſe pages 13. 62. 63. 64.*

* *Which name they vniuſtly giue to thoſe, that iuſtly for this their extremity forſake their fellowſhip*

2 Secondly, I would desier the Reader not to be carried away with the multitude of corruptions, from the Question or matter in hand, (viz. Whether the good doctrines of the Churches of England are sufficient to saluation in them that in simplicitie of heart beleeue and imbrace them, notwithstanding the multitude of errors and corruptions which Maister Iohnson repeateth to the contrarie:) But to haue an especiall regard vnto the same. Which is the maine point that hath and doeth altogeather deceiue them, viz. To haue an eye to the corruptions in the Ministerie, worship, and gouernement of the Churches of England: But neuer to looke vnto the nature and force of them, whether *simply* of their owne nature, they ouerthrow faith and Christianitie, or whether they be held of obstinacy and a conuicted conscience, or not. Therefore I pray you marke and examine the errors which they reckon vp, (and I desire the same also of them, for whose good especially I published this Treatise.) And after due consideration, see if those errors are simplie of that nature which before we haue noted. If they be not, (as Maister Iohnson nor all the men in the world, shall euer be able to proue they are:) Then doe they get no aduantage by those errors, to this purpose which they vrge them for, although they were Thrice as many * more as they are. Thus they may see how they haue all this while ben deceiued, and are now to seeke a new for defence of their separation. For I hope they will not say, That euery error, held in simplicitie by Christians, doth cut them off from saluation in Christ; Then should they condempne themselues, vnlesse they hold Anabaptisticall perfection, which surely though I thinke they hold it not simply in their consciences; Yet in their practize (by condemning others so peremtorily, that iump not euen with them in euery point) they come very neare it: But let this passe; wee see then, That of necessitie, the nature of the errors must be regarded, Euery sinne is not a like. Me thinkes then, that they should affoard that fauour to others, which they would haue others to offoard vnto them: namely, That as they would be accompted true Christians, through their faith in Christ, notwithstanding their errours (which they must acknowledge * are infinite manie in this life.) So they should accompt of others in the like case: which euen common sence and humanitie would require them to graunt.

*Notwithstanding they are too many already.

* Psal. 19.12 1.Cor. 13.9.12

To impresse this thing a little better in their mindes, I will a little turne my speech vnto them. And I would pray them, to call to minde the manie errors and corruptions which they beare with amongst themselues, and lay them and the errors with vs togeather, and they shall see their equalitie.

Some of you, hold it vtterly and simply vnlawfull, to sweare by a booke, to proue a will, take an administration or sue in the Ecclesiasticall Courts: To shut vp your shops vpon Holly dayes and Festiuall dayes, &c. And that these are the inuentions of Antichrist, &c. And others of you, hold these things altogeather lawfull, and haue and doe put them in practise, with manie other such like thinges which I could name. But these shall suffice.

Now the thing which I would from hence note is this. Can you among your selues beare with such weighty poinctes as these, which you say are the inuentions & traditions of Antichrist that man of sinne, which (in your accompt) are the † marks of the Beast, * which who soeuer receiueth, shall drinke of the wine of the wrath of God, and shall be tormented in Hell fier for euer? And will not your stumackes serue you, to beare with the Churches of England, in the like, or rather in farr lesser matters? What equitie is there in this? Surely you are (for the most parte) so wholly giuen, and bend your wits and mindes so much, to looke into the estate of other men & other Churches, & to apply the scriptures to thē: As you sildome or neuer look into your own estate, or apply the scriptures to your selues: But looke vnto it, it will be your decay in th'end. You may see thē by your own practize all errors are not alike: But yet, will some say, *are not all the scriptures and commaundements of God fundamentall, and to be obeyed alike? &c.*

† *I would you knew the marks of the Beast a little better.*

* *Rev. 14.*

Obiection.

Answer. Let such consider of this scripture 1.Cor. 3.12.15. amongst many other: which plainly proueth, that many errors (so they be not of obstinacie) may be built by a Christian vpon the *fundation* Christ Iesus, and yet be a true Christian still: For which see further Maister Iacobs answer in Pag. 88. Againe there are errors *simply fundamentall*, which of their owne nature cleane abolish from Christ; such are the errors of the *Arians* concerning the Deitie of Christ: of the *Anabaptists* concerning his humanitie: of the *Papists* concerning Iustification by workes, praying to, and trusting in Saincts, and such like, which directly raze the very fondation. But that any one, or all, of the errors in the Churches of England are of this force, (as you would seeme to hold by all your 9. Reasons) is most impious and vngodly to affirme: And as Maister Iacob very well noteth in his answer to euery one of them: You thereby ouerthrow the Martirs in Queene Maries dayes, from being Christians, who held the very same corruptions in their ministerie, worship, &c. which is now held in England: But say you, *the Martirs saw no further.* Then you confesse against your selues, that our errors doe not simply abolish from Christ (as you euery where affirme most vngodly, especially in defence of your 7. Reason.) But that if men in these things see no further, they are in the same estate with the Martirs. Now if you would haue your Reasons hould, you must proue the Churches of England all conuicted in conscience, which I hope you will not goe about to doe.

Thus much concerning the nature of our errors, whether they be of obstinacie, or against the fundation directly: Which is the Second note I desire to be obserued.

3 Thirdly, I would desire the Reader to obserue, the wresting and misaplying of certen places of scrip-

ſcripture, which (partly in this Treatiſe, and alſo in other their wrytings) they alleadge for their abſolute and peremptory ſeparation from the Churches of England: Which I haue thought not a miſſe here to ſett downe, that thereby the Reader (and them ſelues, vpon better conſideration of the ende and ſcope of the holy Ghoſt in theſe places) may ſee, how they wreſt and miſapply them, cleane contrary from the true and naturall ſence thereof.

The ſcriptures which they alleadge for their ſeparation, are theſe.

Then the ſonnes of God ſaw the daughters of men Gen. 6. 2.

Ye ſhall keepe therefore all mine ordinances and all my iudgments and doe them, that the land whether I bring you to dwell therein ſpew you not out, therefore ſhall ye bee holy vnto me, for I the Lord am holy, and I haue ſeparated you from other people, that you ſhould be mine. Leu. 20. 22. 26.

So the children of Iſraell which were come againe out of captiuitie, and all ſuch as had ſeparated them ſelues vnto them from the filthines of the Heathen of the land, to ſeeke the Lord God of Iſraell, did eate, &c. Ezra. 6. 21.

Departe, departe *ye, goe out from thence, and touch no vncleane thinge, goe out of the middeſt of her, be ye cleane that beare the veſſels of the Lord* Eſa. 52. 11.

Fly *from the middeſt of Babell, and* departe *out of the land of the Caldeans.* Ier. 50. 8. *And* Fly *out of the middeſt of Babell and deliuer euery man his ſoule from the fierce wrath of the Lorde.* Ier. 51. 6. 45

Come *not yee to Gilgall, neither* goe *ye vp to Bethauen.* Hoſ. 4. 15.

Come to Bethell and tranſgreſſe, and to Gilgall and multiply tranſgreſſion, &c. Seeke not Bethell nor enter into Gilgall, and goe not to Beerſheba. Amos. 4. 4. 5.

Saue your ſelues from this froward generation. Act. 2. 40.

And when certen were hardned and diſobeyed ſpeaking euell of the way of God before the multitude, he departed from them and ſeparated the diſcipels, &c. Act. 19. 9.

Therefore come out from among them, and ſeparate *your ſelues ſaith the the Lorde, and touch no vncleane thing, and I will receiue you.* 2. Cor. 6. 17

And I heard another voice from heauen, ſaying, goe out *of her my people, &c.* Reu. 18. 4.

Theſe are the very mayne grounds, on which their ſeparation is builded, which being duly weighed with the ſcope of the text, you ſhall very eaſely finde, that not one amongeſt them all, will hold in proportion with this time, nor beare the ſeparation they gather frō them. Firſt becauſe either they concerne ſuch times and ſtates as the people that liued in them were profeſſors of, or ſubiect vnto, open groſſe Infidelitie, & either Heathen or Antichriſtiā Idolatry, not in ſome particuler cuſtomes & outward ordināces, but in the whole body and power of Heathen & Antichriſtian religion, ſuch as could not poſſibly ſtand with true faith and religion at all: Which can not be ſaid of theſe times & preſent ſtandings, without open vntruth. 2 Or els becauſe if they be not of that ſort, they affoard no ſuch abſolute ſeparation at all, but only frō *wilful, rebellious*, & *obſtinate* diſobeyers, & euill ſpeakers, and from apparant groſſe corruptions, but not from the whole publike body of thoſe Aſſemblies, nor from the lawfull and good things vſed in ſuch times and ſtandings, as haue not wholy ſwarued from the faith, though there were diuers grieuous faults, both in doctrine and practize, ſuffered among them. As by the example of the Iewiſh Churches in the times of the Prophets, eſpecially of Chriſt him ſelfe, may plainly appeare. The Euangeliſtes make mention in diuers places, *That they worſhipped God in vaine, teaching for doctrine mens preceptes. They made their proſelites the Children of Hell Two fold more then they were before. They made the commaundements of God of none effect by their traditions. Such as beleeued in Chriſt they excommunicated, &c.* Yet were they a true Church, notwithſtanding theſe, and many other grieuous enormities: with whom Chriſt himſelf and his Apoſtles, had communion and fellowſhip, ſometime in thoſe good things that were among them. And ſo might they with the Churches of England, without iuſtifying or allowing theſe things, which they ſee to be euill. All which things doe more fully appeare in the conference it ſelfe, as it followeth hereafter.

But vnto the examples of theſe Churches, me thinkes I heare already that common anſwer and laſt refuge of theirs: which is this. *Thoſe Churches* (ſay they) *were in a true outward conſtitution, And therfore were the true Churches of Chriſt, notwithſtanding thoſe groſſe errors which they held in other poincts of doctrine and practize: But contrariwiſe* (ſay they) *the Churches of England haue a falſe outward conſtitution, and therefore they are no true Churches of Chriſt, notwithſtanding their truthes of doctrine, &c.* Obiection.

So the outward conſtitution is the maine poinct on which they wholy depend, and for which, they wholy condempne the Churches of England from being true Chriſtians & in ſtate of ſaluation: Which I doubt not plainly to take away. 1 And firſt concerning the conſtitution of the Iewiſh Churches. If we ſhould examine the ſame, we ſhould finde that it was as greatly altered and corrupted, as is the conſtitution of the Churches of England. Two high Prieſts hauing by ſimony crept in at once, which was vnlawfull, and contrarie to Gods ordinance, (notwithſtanding their gloſes in their other writinges, to allow them to be lawfull by * *Zadok* and *Abimelech*, and by ‖ *Seruiah* the chief Prieſte, & *Zephaniah* the Second: which make againſt themſelues:) For there was neuer but one high Prieſt, as Anſwer.

* 2. Chron. 24. 2. 3.

‖ 2. King 25. 18.

* *Answere to Maister Hild. Pag. 50.*

they confesse * (Ergo not two as here were) the rest were indeed inferior to him: And yet amongst those, there was a chiefty also, who were called, sometimes Second Priestes, or Priestes of the Second order, 2. King. 23.4. and sometimes chief Priests, Mat. 27.1. These scriptures being compared with those in the margin by them cited, doe make it more plaine. Now, if the chief offices, were so corrupted and altered through couetousnes, as the Histories make mention: It is not likely, that the inferior offices did remaine sound, but were asmuch or more altered: The Priests (generally) being such couetous wicked persons, their offices beeing very gainefull: and besides they liuing vnder the authoritie of the Heathenish Romans, who ruled ouer them. All these things considered, it is very likely that y offices & outward constitution (on which they so much depend) were wholy altered from the right institution, and therefore would make nothing for thē. As for their allegation of Mat. 23.1. Where they say, Christ testifieth that they had true offices, by saying they satt in Moses chaire: It will not help them, any whit at all. For Moses was no Priest, as they were, but a Magistrate: and therefore Moses chaire must be vnderstood of some what else: & themselues * haue vnderstood it heretofore, of Moses doctrine. 2. Secondly (to let their constitution passe, which yet as I haue said, would be found as badde or worse then ours) wee will examine their corruptions in doctrine: Wherein I would know of thē, which are the greater sinnes, of these two sorts, viz. 1. A false and corrupt outward constitution: 2. Or false and corrupt doctrines.

* *Maist. Barrow and Mai. Greenwood, in diuers Letters and Treatists.*

I thinke they will say, the corrupt and false doctrines are the greater, as they are indeed: For that they, doe wound, fester and corrupt the very conscience, and doe deceiue the hearers thereof, Whereas the errors in the constitution of a Church, (especially in some circumstances (as the errors with vs are) and those of no small controuersie, in mauers also not fundamentall) are nothing nere so hurtfull: by howe much the Tithing of Mint, Annis, and Commin, are of lesser force then the other weightier matters of the law. Now from hence, I Reason thus.

If the greater sinnes (namely in doctrine) doe not simply ouerthrow a companie of Christians, from being a true Church: Then much lesse will the lesser sinnes (namely in the outward constitution, &c.)

But the false doctrines (which are the greater sinnes) themselues confesse by the example of the said Churches doe not. Therefore neither will the lesser.

For the better explayning of this poinct, I would pray them resolue me of this question.

What if a company of *Arians*, *Anabaptistes*, or *Papistes*, shoud bee gathered and established in a true outward constitution, and still reteyne their fundamentall errors before " named: Whether should their outward constitution make them a true Church, yea or no? I thinke they will say no. Thus I hope then it appeareth, That the outward constitution whether salty or true, availeth nothing to the ouerthrowing or making of a true Church, vnlesse other doctrines of the foundation, either false or true, doe concurre therewith. And thus their Obiection of the Iewish constitution, is (I trust) fully answered: So that still their peremptory separation and condempning of the Churches of England, for some outward corruptions, remayneth still a grieuous sinne vpon their heades: for which (without harty repentance) they shall one day answer before God, which will be too heauie a burthen for them to beare.

" *pag. 4.*

Lastly, concerning our corruptions: As we cannot iustifie them to be no corruptions, (but must needes acknowledge, that there are many yet remaining in our land, which were left by that man of sinne & are as thornes vnto our sides, which we hope God will in time abolish): So dare we not runne into your extremities, to condempne our Churches for such corruptions, but waight the appointed time of God for the redresse thereof. Yet in the meane time, so longe as those most excellent truthes and doctrines of saluation, (for which God make vs thankfull) are still reteyned and held, as soundly as by any Church vpon the face of the earth (the other errors not simply ouerthrowing the same, beeing not held of obstinacy, and being also for the most parte, of great controuersie and disputation amonge the learned:) So long I say, communion in things lawfull, is to be kept with them, as before is noted in the example of other Churches: Otherwise, it will come to passe, (by reason of the * diuersitie in opinions and iudgmentes which by the corruption of our nature we remaine in, in this tabernacle, as hath " bene in all ages, and * shalbe, so long as this life of imperfection indureth,) that no communion can euer bee had with any Church liuing, no nor any one Christian with another: Which to affirme, were most absurd and vngodly.

Iudg. 2. 3.

* *Mat. 25.13. to 23.*
" *Leu. 4.*
Psal. 19.12.
* *1 Cor. 13.9, 12.*

These obseruations beeing considered, I doubt not but the Lorde will adde a blessing to this worke, That such as are simple hearted, and haue exceeded in eagernesse of zeale: may see their extremitie, in so rashly and vnaduisedly separating from, and condempning the Churches of England, sometimes their Nurses and Mothers, as before is noted: Whereby God may haue the glory, and themselues the comforte, euen the saluation of their soules through Christ.

D. B.

AN ARGVMENT PROVING THAT the Churches of England are the true *Churches of God.*

VVHatsoeuer is sufficient to make a particuler man a true Christian and in state of saluation; That is sufficient to make a companie so gathered togeather, to bee a true Church.

BVt the whole doctrine, as it is publiquelie * professed, and practized, by law in England, is sufficient to make a particuler man a true Christian, and in state of saluation (* *and our publique Assemblies are therein gathered togeather.*)

* Booke of Articles published Anno 1562.

* See further for these words in Pag. 3.

THerefore it is sufficient to make the publique Assemblies true Churches.

H. IACOB.

Againſt the Aſſumption of the ſaid Argument, Mr *Iohnſon* made 3. Exceptions and 9. Reaſons, which hereafter follow in order: Togèther with Mr *Iacobs* Replies vnto the ſame.

But before we come to the examination of the ſaide *Aſſumption, let vs ſee firſt what he ſaith againſt the Propoſition.*

Fr. IOHNSON.

TO omitt the Propoſition, vntill it better appeare by their defence of the Aſſumption how to take and vnderſtand it, We will for the preſent only ſhewe the weakenes of the Aſſumption: and this alſo the rather, becauſe they ſeeme wholy to depend vpon it.

H. IACOB.

THe anſwerer omitteth the Propoſition, for in deed it is moſt certen: But he denyeth the Aſſumption, (which yet is as certen alſo), That the doctrine in our booke of Articles is ſufficient to make a true Chriſtian.

Fr. IOHNSON.

IN our former anſwere to this argument, we omitted the propoſition, not becauſe of the certentie of it euery way (as the Replier dreameth) but vntill we might ſee by his defence of the aſſumption how to take it, as the we noted. Nowe therefore (hauing ſeene in his reply the vnlearned, vngodly, and vnconſcionable pretences, by which he would ſeeme to defende the Aſſumption, when in deed he doth nothing elſe but caſt a miſte before the eyes of the ſimple): We giue him to vnderſtand, that the whole argument is lame and faultie in euery parte thereof. The Propoſition is not abſolutelie true, as it appeareth he vnderſtandeth it, by his defence of the Aſſumption. The Aſſumption is not only falſe, as We proued in our former anſwer, but alſo lacketh a foote whereon it ſhould goe, if it were perfect and entier.

† The Aſſumption is examined and maintained Pag. 4.

For Whereas in the Propoſition, mention is made, not only of the making of a true Chriſtian, but alſo of a companie ſo gathered together: he ſhould (in the Aſſumption, if he would haue had it ſound and perfect) not onely haue aſſumed, that the doctrine &c. is ſufficient to make a true Chriſtian: but haue added alſo, that their aſſemblies be cõpanies ſo gathered togither.

Which being not done, both the Assumption wanteth one of the feete, and the conclusion inferreth more then was in the premisses, and so the whole silogisme is faultie and disfigured.

Thus might we, without any further answer, returne this argument to the first framers of it, to be better fashioned: Yet in hope, that they may bee brought (through the blessing of God) to receiue the loue of the trueth, that they may be saued, and with their giftes no more to plead for, and deck the whore of Babilon, & to help forward the building & beautifying of Sion, we will more particularly lay open to them, the weaknes of this his reply.

And first, whereas he affirmeth, that the Proposition is most certen, & yet in his defence of the Assumption, he declareth, that he so taketh it, as whatsoeuer amongst them, be iointly togeather held, and ioyned with that, which otherwise might make a ture Christian, or a true Church: yet notwithstanding, they are so to be reputed, as if there were no such additions or commixtures: we answere that in this sence, the Proposition neither is, nor can be absolutely true, as it ought to be, if they would haue their argument good. For who knoweth not, that such "* *things may bee ioined with Christ, as abolish from Christ. And againe,* † *that Christ and Antichrist can not accord togither. Either therefore the Proposition is not generall, but admitteth limitations, and then is not the Argument good: Or if it bee generall, without any limitation, so as whatsoeuer be added too (or comingled with) that which otherwise might make a true Christian, or a true Church, yet it hindreth nothing at all: Thē is it not absolutely true in such vnderstanding, as may appeare by the former exceptions, & diuers other that might be alleadged.*

* Gal. 5. 2. 4.

† 2. Cor. 6. 14, 15.

Next touching the Assumption, besides that it is lame, as before is shewed, it is also vntrue, as in our former answer appeareth. Some balme indeed this man bringeth to cure it: but it hath no other effect, saue onely to manifest to vs so much the more, that the soare of their Assemblies cannot be healed. In our former answere, we first tooke 3. Exceptions against them, comparing together their profession and practise, then we alleadged 9. Reasons, directly concluding the falshood of the Assumption.

H. IACOB.

BEfore I examine this your answer, I would desire you, and all others, to note, that all your Exceptions and Reasons, with your defence of them, hereafter following, doe consist of these three generall pointes.

1. That euerie person in England, holding our publik faith, is no true Christian.

2. That all the Christians and Churches in King Edwards time

time, and namelie *Maister Cranmer, M. Ridley, M. Hooper, M. Latimer, M. Philpot, M. Saunders, M. Rogers, M. Taylor, &c.* were all lims of Antichrist, and no true Christians.

3. That euery soule in England, is convicted in conscience, that the Prælacie is vnlawfull and vntollerable.

The First of these, is our maine question, and the grounde of all our reasoning, which you gainsay. The Second, though it be not expreslie spoken, yet it is directlie, euidently, and vndeniably concluded, by all & euery of your arguments against vs. As in the seueralls hereafter we shal see. The Third, you are driuen vnto, for defence of your former Assertion, which else falleth to the grounde. And this you affirme flatly in your defence of your 1. 6. and 7. Reasons.

Nowe my desire is, that all men would take notice of these your 3: Assertions, and consider indifferentlie, vvhether they proceede from an honest, a sober, or a Christian minde. And you M. Iohnson, if you list hereafter to say any more, defende these 3. pointes directly and plainly, that your answveres may be briefer, and more certen, then now they are.

Novve I come to the particular examination of your former answerere.

First you say, *You omitted the Proposition before, not for the soundnes of it, but only, because you would see howe I meant it.* Why? He that hath but halfe an eye, may see the meaning of those vvordes, where is no darknes nor doubtfulnes of sence at all. What fault finde you in it nowe? Forsooth, first a want in the Assumption, & then vntruethes, both in the Proposition, and Assumption of my Sillogisme. There wanteth (you say) that I should expresse in the Assumptiō, *That our Assemblies be companies gathered togeather in the doctrines & ordinances which we all by lawe publiquely professe and practise.* Who but a wrangler would not vnderstand that I meant so much? Nay doe not my expresse wordes imply asmuch: vvhen I say, We by lavve publiquely professe and practise them? Then are not our Assemblies (vvhich are by lavv) gathered together in this profession & povver? Fy for shame, these are senceless cauilations. But because vvhat in me lyeth, I vvould not haue you any more to stumble at a strawe, I haue to satisfie you vvithall, novve added those words to the Assumption aforesaid in a contrarie letter which you desire, viz. *and our publike assemblies are therein gathered togeather.*

Not that the Argumēt is vnsound without this addition: But because ỹ Reader may see howe you will play at a smal game rather then sit out, vt aiunt.

Secondly, you say, that my proposition meaneth, *that what soeuer is held togeather and ioyned, with that which otherwise might make a true Christian, or a true Church: Yet notwithstanding they are so to be reputed, as if there were no such additions or comixtures.* O strange dealing: in all my writing I haue no such worde, no silable, no letter, sounding to that sence I haue directly contrary, in my answere to your Fourth Rea-

ſon, as your ſelf noteth there. Yet yow M. *Iohnſon*, with ont al ſhame, in the view of the world, doe Father on me this foule vntruth, and moſt ſenceleſſe errour, in your firſt entrance.

Further, where as it ſeemeth you reproue my Propoſion, requiring to to haue it ſet thus: Whatſoeuer is ſufficient to make a particuler man a true Chriſtian *(and hath nothing added with it diſtroying the foundation of faith)* That is ſufficient to make a company ſo gathered togither, a true Church.

You muſt know Mr. *Iohnſon*, that that were an idle & vaine addition: for whereſoeuer there are any ſuch things added diſtroying faith, there whatſoeuer elſe ſeemeth ſufficient, indeed it is not ſufficient to make a true Chriſtian. Wherefore *nodum in ſcirpo quaris*, this is to finde a knot in a ruſh. Thus much concerning the trunes of my Propoſition.

The Aſſumption examined by the Exceptions and Reaſons following

Laſtly you come to deny my Aſſumption, or rather to maintaine your denyall heretofore giuen. Where firſt note that by denying my aſſumption, yovv affirme the firſt generall poinct noted in this beginning. That euery particuler perſon in England, holding our publike faith here, is no true Chriſtian. Which (O Lorde) who would not tremble to thinke on? Euen that which this man aboue two yeares a goe affirmed, and now againe aduiſedly and wilfully defendeth. I take heauen and earth to record this day, whether this be not deſperate madnes, yea or no. But let vs examine your exceptions, and reaſons againſt my Aſſumption more particularly, & we ſhall ſee what ſtuffe it is. Your firſt exception againſt the ſame is as followeth.

Maiſter Iohnſons I. Exception againſt the former Aſſumption: with Maiſter Iacobs Replies to the ſame.

EXCEPTION. I.

FIrſt let here be conſidered the 19. Article of that doctrine and booke, which is alleaged by themſelues for their defence, and ſee if their profeſſion and practize be not contrary one to an other: Yea whether euen by their owne doctrine and confeſſion, conteyned in that booke, it be not manifeſt, that they haue not a true viſible Church of Chriſt.

The words of the Article are theſe.

Artic. 19. The viſible Church of Chriſt is a Congregation of faithfull men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duely miniſtred, according to Chriſts ordinance, in all thoſe things, that of neceſſitie are requiſite to the ſame.

Theſe are their owne wordes and doctrine: Now if they cannot proue their Aſſemblies to be ſuch, they may ſee that their own witneſſes, (euen their owne doctrine & booke alleadged) giue verdict againſt thē. If they can

proue

proue them to be such: where and what are their proofes, touching the particulers, mentioned in this their owne discription of a visible Church of Christ.

H. IACOB his I. Reply to the 1. Excep.

THis his first Exception, is the 19. Article of this very book which we alleage, wherein a visible Church is discribed to be a Congregation, where the pure word is preached, and Sacramentes ministered, according to all those thinges, that of necessitie are requisite. Now this discription, he reiecteth not, but our practise (saith he) is contrary: and therefore we haue no true visible Churches, nor Christians.

I answer: wherin is it contrarie? in what things that of necessitie are requisite? doth not all this Christian world see & confesse, that our publike practise, is agreable to our profession in that booke? Nay (saith he) *but proue you your assemblies to be such, and if you can proue them, where and what are your proofs? if you do not, you are confuted.* A worthy confutacion sure, & very Clercklike: As if my Tenaunt should deny me rent for my house & land, yea and go to law with me for the fee simple, which he hath holden in ferme of me these 40. yeares. and I haue hetherto, quietlie enioyed from my Aunceſtours, time out of minde: Now he suing me at law, for that which I thus possesse, saith, proue your right to this land which you haue; if you can, what, and where, be your proofes? let me see them: Or els I your Tenaunt will haue it: This were goodly dealing, were it not, and very lawfull. Euen so doe you, asking proofes of vs for that which we possesse, and haue possessed before you made any question about it, nay you your selues, held parte of this possession of vs and with vs, till yesterday, when you began first to lay claime in this sorte to the whole. Now your reason is, *let vs proue it to be ours, where be our proofs? Or els you will not acknowledge vs any longer:* see I pray you your owne equity. If this suffice not to make you desist, I leaue it to the Iudges to giue sentence.

Secondly note further: Our Article saith, A Church is where the word is preached, & Sacraments ministred according to all things that of necessitie are requisite. Where we plainly insinuate, that many errors may be added, & truthes wanting in a visible Church: but nothing which is absolutely necessary: Now, what doth our practize, in Preaching, or Sacraments, want, that is absolutely necessarie, without which, there cannot be any true preaching or Sacraments at all, shew it vs because we see it not our selues I assure you; vntill then, your first reason hath no reason in it.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 1. Excep.

HOw fit or vnfit the said discription of a visible Church (mentioned in the 19. Article of the said book) is, we neither did, nor doe examine. Onely because this is their owne profession, and wee see their practise is contrary vnto it, we did therfore from hence take our first exception, requiring of them, to shew their assemblies to be such, or els to know, that their own discription, is a witnes against themselues.

Now in their reply, haue they according to the particulers of that description, iustified their Church-assemblies? nothing lesse. Let this therefore be first obserued. But what then haue they donne? Surely this. First pretending as if they repeated our exception, and their owne discription, they leaue out diuers perticulers, of speciall moment there expressed, as first, where the visible Church is discribed, to bee a congregation of faithfull men, *they leaue out these wordes* (of faithfull men) *belike knowing that their Congregations, which are holds of all foule spirits, and cages of euery vncleane and hatefull bird, cannot therefore iustly bee accoumpted congregations of faithfull men. Secondly, where the description speaketh,* that the Sacraments be duely ministered: *they leaue out the word* (duely:) *becauſe it crosseth their womens Baptisme, priuate Communion, receiuing of the most prophane and their seede, &c. Lastly, where in the description it is reqaired, both for preaching the pure word and due administration of the Sacraments, that they be donne according to Christes ordinance: they leaue out altogither these words* (according to Christes ordinance:) *belike because this clause quite ouerthroweth both their Antichristian Prelacy, from which all the inferior Ministers amongst them receiue power and authoritie to preach, and minister the Sacramentes, and their Priesthood and Deaconery, wherein they all administer, and their stinted imposed prayers, exhortations, crosses on the forehead, questiones to the infantes, vse of the same wordes in English in ministering the Lords supper, which the papists vsed and still vse in Latine, not reteyning the words of Christs institution, and such like.*

Reuel. 18. 2.

Now thus hauing left out such perticulers as were of spetiall moment against them, they next demaund wherein their practize is contrary to their profession, and discription of a visible Church, in what things that of necessitie are requisite? *We aunswere, in all the particulers of that description aforesaid.*

For first, their Church-assemblies, are not congregations of faithfull men, but a confusion of all manner of people though neuer so wicked and prophane. The " *Prelates and Formalistes affirme, that their Church is full of Atheistes, Papistes, Idolaters, Drunkards, Whoremõgers, & such like. The* † *forward Preachers likewise auerre, that in their church are swarmes of Atheists, Idolators, Papistes, erronious & heretical sectaries, Witches, Charmers, Sorcerers, Murtherers, Theeues, Adulterers, Lyers, &c. Finally, that a mã may be any thing amongst thẽ, sauing a sound Christian. These things being so, as both their estate and writings beare witnesse: let them selues iudge, whether their Assemblies can be accounted Congregations of faithfull men, or no: which is the first poinct of the description aforesaid.*

" D. Whithg last booke, pag. 176. and 178.

† Sermon on Rom. 12. pag. 65. and 66. Demonstratiõ in the preface.

Second-

Secondly, in the same description is required, That the pure worde of God be preached, according to Christes ordinance. *But amongst them, are allowed besides the word of God, the Apocripha bookes: and in stead of preaching the worde, the reading of Homilies: as may appeare in that booke of Articles alleadged by them selues. Yet who knoweth not, that in those bookes, are diuers vntruthes, errors, contradictions, blasphemies, and such like? So farre are they from being the pure word of God, or agreeing therewith. Moreouer, when and where the worde is preached among them, it is done by vertue of a false office and calling, neuer appointed by Christ. And the Ministers that preach it, doe in their constitution stand alwayes subiect, to be silenced, suspended, excommunicated, and degraded by the Prelates and Ordinaries, to whom (when they are made Priestes,) they promise, and (when they enter vpon a benefice) they sweare, Canonicall obedience. Neither are they suffered any further to preach the word, and trueth of God, then agreeth with the Articles, Iniunctions, aduertisements, and caueats, in that behalfe prouided. If any preach the worde of God anie further, they are subiect to be silenced, banished, & put to death. That these things accord with the ordinance of Christ, or with their owne description of a visible Church, we suppose them selues will not for shame affirme it.*

Lastlie, in their description it is required, That the Sacramentes bee duely ministred, according to the ordinance of Christ, in all things, that of necessitie are requisite to the same. *Nowe by the ordinance of Christ, in the administration of the Sacramentes, there are necessarilie required 1. A lawfull Minister. 2. A lawfull people. And thirdly, A lawfull administration, according to the Testament of Christ: In all which, their practize is conerarie to the ordinance of Christ, and their own description aforesaid. Their Ministers all of them are either Prelates, Priestes, or Deacons (which amongst them is a step to the Priesthood:) none of which Christ hath ordeyned in his Testament for the worke of his ministerie. Their people are not separated from the world, but stande in confusion with it, and in subiection to the Antichristian Prelates and Prelacie: And therefore can not be deemed a true church of God, & the people of Christ, vnto whom in such estate the Sacraments (which are seales of the couenant of grace) doe apperteyne, and may be administred. Finally, their administration is according to the inuentions and precepts of man, with stinted prayers, exhortations, Epistles and Gospels: and besides those in Baptisme, crossing on the forehead, & questions to the infant: in the Lords supper, translating, and vsing out of the Masse booke, other wordes then the wordes of Christes institution, and such like, as may bee seene at large in their booke of common prayer, which is picked and culled out of the Masse*

See Iohn. 15. 19. & 17. 14. 16. 1. Iohn. 4. 5, 6. Act. 2. 40. and 19. 9. Reuel. 18. 4. & 14. 9.

" Admonitiõ to the Parlament, second treatis.

Masse booke, full of all abominations, as " them selues haue published heretofore.

These things we haue ben forced thus to mention at large, both because they twice demaund (as if they knewe not themselues) wherein their practise is contrarie to that description aforesaid: and because they blush not to affirme, that all the Christian world seeth and confesseth their practize to be aggreeable to their profession in that booke. Whereas the contrarie is most true.

Touching which, what them selues haue heretofore written to the contrarie: See in the Admonitions to the Parleament, Replyes of T. C. against D. Whitguift, Demonstration of Discipline, &c, And what the reformed Churches professe to the contrarie: see in the Frenche, Belgicke, and Heluetian Churches, and in the Harmonie of cõfessions, Sect. 10. & 11. which would be too long to set downe at large in this place: Neither is it needfull, seeing it is most euident in the books and places alleadged, whether we referre the Reader.

Thus also it appeared, what iust cause wee had, to put them to proue their assemblies, to be such, as them selues discribe visible Churches to bee: Which, seing they haue not yet done, and seing their practice is contrarie to their profession, as now (at their request) we haue shewed in the perticulers afore said: If they still bee minded as before, wee doe also still aske, where and what are their proofes, touching the perticulers mentioned in their owne description of a visible Church.

Their similitude of a Landlord and Tennaunt, *is against them selues, so worthy and Clercklike is their reply. If any haue vsurped, or otherwise made a false clame neuer so long, to a piece of lãd or other possession: may they not iustly be called vpon to shew their title & bring fourth their euidence? Let the Iudges giue sentence. If I deny their clame and title to be such, let him shew their euidence from the Apostles writinges: Let vs from thence see their euidence for the offices of Archbs., Lordbs., Suffraganas, Archdeacons, Chauncelers, Commissaries, Officials, Priests, Parsons, Vicars, Cnraets, &c: For their entrance into their Offices, according to their Cannons, and Booke of ordering Priestes and Deacons, and of consecrating Archbishops and Bishops: For their administration by their stinted imposed Liturgy, and by their Popish Cannons, Officers and proceedings: For their Churching of women, praying ouer the dead, Holydayes to Saints and Angels, Fastes on their Eaues, &c. For their maintenance by Tythes, Chrisomes, Offerings, &c. For their confused communion of all sortes of people, though neuer so wicked, in the body of their Church, &c. Let them (I say) shewe vs euidence for those, from the Apo-*

stles

ſtles writinges, if they deny their claime to bee ſuch, as wee haue noted. Otherwiſe if they ‡ *ſpeake not according to this Word, it is becauſe there is no light in them, neither any right to that they challendge.*

‡ Iſay. 8. 20.

Where they ſay, vve held part of their poſſeſſion vvith thē heretofore: *If they meane, that we with them receiued the beaſtes marke, and drunke of the cup of Babels abominations, we deny it not: but acknowledge Gods mercy, that paſſing ouer our ſinnes, hath giuen vs grace and ſtrength at his* ‖ *commanndement, to forſake that Way of Antichriſt, and to come out of that ſpiritnall Babilon, to the ſaluation of our ſoules, which mercy wee wiſh alſo vnto theſe men, that ſo being ſaued from this froward generatiō, they may become the ſonnes and daughters of the Lord almighty in Chriſt our Sauiour.*

‖ Reue. 18. 4. 2 Cor. 6. 17, 18 Actes. 2. 4.

Touching their Article, Preaching, Sacraments, Miniſtration, &c. enough is ſaid before. Onely where they ſay, they ſee not themſelues wherin they faile, touching Preaching or Sacramēts, in things neceſſary, *It is too impudent vntruth, as their* * *former Writings doe and will alwayes teſtifie to their faces, which wee will not ſtand here to relate. That ſhall ſuffice which we haue touched before, which till it bee aunſwered, it will be found that our firſt exception hath both reaſon and weight in it whatſoeuer they doe or can pretend to the contrarie.*

* Admonition to the Parliament: T. C. his replies in defence thereof: Demonſtratiō of diſcipline. Declaration & defence of Eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, &c.

H. IACOB his 2. Reply to the 1. Excep.

HEre is much adoe to no purpoſe. You obſerue 4. pointes in our Article omitted by mee, vvherein our practize is contrarie to our profeſſion. Firſte, our Article requireth a viſible Church to bee an aſſembly of faithfull men: *But our aſſemblies* (ſay you) *are not ſo.* This is falſe, they are ſo, you ſhall neuer proue in vs the contrarie, more then appeareth was in the Church of the Iewes, both Auncient and in the time of Chriſt, And yet they then were the true Church: As I haue elſwhere in this Booke ſufficiently proued and ſhewed againſt you. That which you bring of *D. Whitgift* and other writers amongſt vs of the prophaneſſe of many in our aſſemblies, you depraue their meaninges vtterlie: for though they graunt verie many ſuch to be amongſt vs, yet they ſay not, that all our aſſemblies are ſuch, nor our whole aſſemblies: Neither denie they our aſſemblies to be companies of faithfull men, or vtterly to be ſeparated from: Nay, the contrarie doe they: euen that onely they ought to be reformed. Therefore you too groſſely abuſe them.

Secondly, The Article requireth the pure worde of God to be preached. But (ſay you) the Apocrypha bookes, & reading of Homilies, & other errors are allowed in our practize: Yea ſurely & in our profeſſiō too as your ſelfe obſerueth in the book of Artic. yet then our profeſſion & practiſe differ not, as you charg our Churches, But theſe poinctes are not the pure word of God: Neither

doth the Article meane, that in a visible church, euery iot & title, both of our professiō & practize, must needs be out of the pure word. They knew that euery visible Church might & did erre in somewhat. Onely it meaneth, that a visible Church might not erre in any point, that of necessitie is requisite, as their wordes expresse. It resteth then that you shew, that the pure word is not preached in our assemblies by law, sufficiently to saluation: which yet you doe not, nor can doe. Therefore you say nothing. For, I for my part know well, that our Churches faile from the pure word in sundrie lesser points, which though they be errours, yet are they not Fundamentall, neither doe they in their owne nature abolish from Christ.

Thirdlie, the Article hath according to Christes ordinance: But you saye, *that we preach in strange and false functions, such as are not Christes ordinances.* This is false too, Our ordinarie Preachers are true Pastours, as touching the substance of Pastorall calling, as I haue often aunswered you, albeit they haue a wrong ordination from the Prelacie. See my defence of this point, as also of that concerning the confusion of our people, in my other writing long since deliuered to you, touching the comparing of the condition of a Ministerie with Mariadge. Now this ordinance of Christ to haue a true Pastor to a faithfull people, is sufficient for the being of a true Church, though not for the perfection of it. Contrarie to the which, you haue nothing but words.

* In my aunswer to the 1. reason of that treatise following in the end of this booke.

Lastlie, the Article requireth due administration of Sacraments: *But our practize (say you) herein is not due or intier, because there concurre diuers corruptions withall: as stinted prayers, exhortations, Epistles, Gospels, & Crossing in Baptisme, &c.* I answere: all these simplie of them selues doe not abolishe our Sacraments. If you thinke they doe, say so, and you shalbe refuted. If nay, Then this very Article signifieth so much, That corruptions and faultes might be in the Sacraments, but nothing amisse that of necessitie is requisite.

Nowe, *all these 4. pointes I haue omitted* (say you.) True in wordes I haue, but in sence I expresse them all and euery one, when for breuities sake, I comprehended all in this generall clause of this Article, according to all that is of necessitie requisite. How say you, haue I not herein conteyned and signified all these your exceptions, and that accordinge to the meaning of the Article? If I haue (as it is most true) then doe you vnconscionablie abuse me, in saying, I pretended to repeate our description in the Article, and yet leaue out diuers particulars of speciall moment. And let this therefore be first obserued, I haue omitted nothing materiall in that Article. Yea let this be here noted, that in all this you haue moste fondlie abused your penne and tounge. Yet will you still demaund *how our practise agreeth with our profession in that 19. Article?* Still I answer you with that similitude of a fooliſh and importunate Tēnaunt against his Landlord. If I haue held possession, and my aunestors before my time out of minde, indeed the King laying claime to it, hee may call for

for my euidence, becauſe * *nullum tempus occurrit Regi*, But againſt my fellow ſubiects, poſſeſſion & inheritance (ſo longe without interruption) is of it ſelfe euidence in lawe good enough, except the plaintif can bring better to the contrary. Therefore it were abſurd and ſenceleſſe before any Iudge in England, for a Tenaunt to put ſuch a Landlord to ſhew his euidence in ſuch a caſe. Euen ſo, as abſurd it is for you, ſeeing at firſt you were of vs and now are gone out from vs, to put vs to proue our ſelues to be ſuch as heretofore you neuer doubted of. If now you doubt and contradict it, ſhew you your reaſon as better euidence, or els all men wil condempne your folly.

* Time preſcribeth not againſt the Prince.

Where *you put me to proue all our offices of the Hyerarchie, their ceremonies, &c.* What needeth it? I neuer tooke it vpon me: Except firſt you doe ſhew, that theſe corruptions all or any of them, abſolutely in their own nature doe aboliſh vs all cleane from Chriſt, & make vs vnpoſſible to be ſaued, which vntill you doe, ſtill I ſay, I ſee not any peece of reaſon in all theſe your words.

And laſtly where you ſay, *it is an impudent vntruth, that I ſay we ſee not, that any thing neceſſarie is wanting in our Church, And to this end you quote to conuince me*, The Admonition. T. C. his Replies, Demonſtration, Declaration, and the Defence of Diſcipline, &c. This is indeed too bold an vntrueth, & a wilfull peruerting of your allegations. None of all theſe doe graunt any thing to be wanting with vs that is neceſſary to the being of a Church ſimply, nor to the *being* of a true Miniſtery or Sacraments: But onely to their well and *conuenient* being. How honeſt then are you to falſifie your own witneſſes ſo openly?

Maiſter Iohnſons 2. Exception againſt the former Aſſumption, with Maiſter Iacobs Replies to the ſame.

EXCEPTION 2.

SEcondly let them tell vs, whether they hold & profeſſe Ieſus Chriſt to be the Prophet, Prieſt and King of his Church, to be obeyed in his own ordinance onely, and in no other. And if they doe, then let them ſhew vs how their practize agreeth with this profeſſion.

H. IACOB his 1. Reply to the 2. Excep.

TO this Second Exception That Chriſt is our Prophet Prieſt, & King, I aunſwere: The booke of Articles, our Miniſters now, and Congregations generally, doe hold and profeſſe the ſame (our practize be-

ing answerable likewise thervnto) euen as before time Maister *Cranmer*, *Ridley Latimer*, and such like, with their Congregations did then: viz. That Christ is our Prophet, Priest and King, and to be obeyed in his own ordinances onely and in no other. This I say we generally professe and practize. Howbeit this note with all, we hold Christs ordinance to be of two sortes, written or vnwritten, the first necessary, the second arbitrary. The firste touching doctrine, that is, touching faith and the inward opinion only, such as these, The doctrine of God, his Nature, his Persons, his Properties, of the Messias Christ Iesus, of Iustification, of Sanctification, of the Resurection, &c. Wherein standeth the ‡ foundation of sauing faith. All these must be in the writen word or els to bee none of Christes. The second touching outward orders in the Church, which are truly called & accounted Christs own also, although particularly deuised and appointed by the Church, whom Christ hath authorized therevnto, euen as it shalbe thought most fit and profitable for the present times, places and persons: such we hold all outward gouernement and ceremonies to bee, because they be not simply of the foundation, neither written, nor certen, nor perpetuall, but at the arbitrarie appointment of the Church and Magistrate, and yet to be Christes owne neuertheless, who hath left this libertie for the Church to vse; Thus we hold and thus we practise, and wee are perswaded no Scripture to be against all this, but rather for it. I speake now concerning our Ministers and Congregations generally; that is our publike Church state. If yow say, but there are diuers amongest vs that thinke otherwise, I answere, But this is the generall estate both of our Ministers and Churches, howsoeuer one or two amongest hundreths or thousands may thinke otherwise, shew the contrary if you can. And our Churches, they certenly must bee deemed after their generall estate and constitution, not as one or two men thinke. If you say, this generall opinion and practize is an error, Therefore they obey not Christs ordinances in truth herein, though they thinke they doe. I answere, let it be so, it is now * the error of their iudgment, as it was in Maister *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, *&c.* Not pregnaunt rebellion and disobedience to Christe, not a conuicted or seared conscience, so that their other "truthes of the foundation are not fruſtrat, nor Christ made to none effect in the. And this is all our questiō, *Whether they remaine Christians still for all these faultes, yea, or no.*

‡ 1. Cor. 3. 12. 13.

* An error, though not foundamētall.

" 1. Cor. 3. 12 15.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 2. Excep:

CConcerning our Second Exception, it was propounded by way of demaund, requiring that they would shewe vs, if they held Iesus Christ to be the Prophet, Priest, & King of his Church, to be obeyed in his own ordinances onely and in no other, howe then their practize agreeth with this profession. One would haue thought that here it had bene good and needfull (if they could) to haue cleared this poinct by the Scriptures and the Testament of Christ, and from thence to haue manifested, that their Ministerie, worship, ministration, gouernement, &c. which are called

in

in queſtiõ, are no other then the Lord Ieſus Chriſt, (that Prophet, Prieſt and King of his Church) hath in his Teſtament giuen and appointed therevnto. And haue they not done this? Surely no. What then doe they ſay? Firſt they tell vs, That touching this poinct, their profeſſion and practize nowe is ſo as before time it was with M. *Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer* and their Cogregations. *But what of this? Can the perſons or age of thes whom he nameth, nay can anie perſon or ages preiudice the trueth? Were not they ſubiect to error at all? or muſt their errors binde vs: Did not Iohn Hus (that worthy champion of Chriſt) and others alſo of the Martyrs in former times, ſay and heare Maſſe, euen to their dying day, not ſeeing the abomin ations thereof? And did not diuers of thẽ acknowledge, ſome the Popes calling and Supremacie, ſome 7. Sacramentes, ſome Purgatorie, ſome Auricular confeſſion, and ſuch like greeuous errours, &c, And yet notwithſtanding dyed moſt conſtantly for the truethes which they ſawe and teſtified, ſome for one, and ſome for another, as God manifeſted the trueth vnto them: As may be ſeene at large in their ſeueral Hiſtories in the Actes and Monumentes, whether wee referre the Reader. But may we nowe ſo profeſſe and practize in theſe things as they did? Or if we ſhould, were their ignorance and errours a ſufficient defence for vs? yet thus would this man beare vs in hande. But moreouer, let him tell vs, if Maiſter Latimer and others, did not forſake the Prelacie and functions they had before-time receyued? And Maiſter Ridley at his death repent that he had bene ſo earneſt for the remnantes of Poperie in his time retayned? Beſides alſo, who knoweth not, that when Maiſter Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, &c. dyed Martyrs for the trueth of Chriſt, they neither had them ſelues, nor ioyned in ſpirituall communion with ſuch as had the Prelacie and Miniſterie nowe pleaded for? And not that onely, but were alſo members of that perſecuted church in Queene Maries dayes, which was ſeparated from the reſt of the Lande, as from the world, and ioyned in couenaunt, by voluntarie profeſſion, to obey the trueth of Chriſt, and to witnes againſt the abominations of Antichriſt, As they alſo did euen vnto death, in the trueth which they ſawe, though otherwiſe being but as it were in the twylight of the Goſpell they had their wantes and errors. Yet who is ſo blinde or beſotted, as not to ſee that their errours may not bee our rules, neither can be our warrant, but rather that we ought after their example, faithfully to ſtand, in, and for, what ſo euer trueth God reuealeth vnto vs by his word. And that otherwiſe, thoſe holy Martyrs ſhould riſe in iudgement againſt all ſuch, as either withhould the trueth in vnrighteouſneſſe, or in any reſpect refuſe to walke therein. Finally, ſeeing GOD hath giuen vs his worde, to be the light of our feete, and rule of our liues and religion: What meane theſe men to lead vs from it, to the aberrations*

of any men whatsoeuer? Should not all people enquire at God, or would they haue vs goe from the liuing to the dead? From God and his worde to men and their errours? Doubtlesse this is that whervnto they would bring vs, and whereby they mislead their followers, as will yet further appeare by that which followeth. For what say they next?

Secondly, they tell vs, and they wishe it to bee noted, (as wee also doe) That Christes ordinances be of two sortes, either written or vnwritten: the first necessarie: the second arbitrary: the first touching doctrine, that is, touching faith and the inward opinion onely: these *(say they)* are written: the second touching outward orders in the Church, and all outward gouernement, and ceremonies: These, they say, are not written, but arbitrary at the appointment of the Church and Magistrate. Thus *(they say)* they hold and practise, and thinke no Scripture is against it.

1 *In answere whereof, First we aske what scripture they haue for this?*
2 *Secondly, we alleadge against it, the scriptures* " *quoted in the margent,*
3 *wherevnto manie other might be added. Thirdlie, let it be obserued, that them selues here graunt and can not denie, but all the outwarde gouernement and ceremonies of their Church, are inuented and arbitrary at the pleasure of man, and not written in the worde of God. Wherevpon it followeth, that they are none of Christes, and therefore not to be ioyned vnto*
4 *in the worship of God, as afterwards more fully will appeare. Fourthlie, see howe neare they are driuen that are glad to runne backe into the Papistes tentes, where yet they knowe there is no succour. Before they pleaded possession time out of minde: nowe they tell vs of ordinances vnwritten, &c. are not these meere popish shiftes, euen the olde worne argumentes of antiquitie and vnwritten verities, so often and so much stoode vppon by the Papistes? Alas that these men should plead to be true Christians, and yet thus openly take parte with Antichrist! What shall we say to these things? Surely God is iust and will verifie his word, where he saieth,* " *That they which receyue not the loue of the trueth, that they may bee saued, hee will sende them stronge delusions, to beleeue lyes, that they may bee damned.*
5 *Fiftly, note howe he maketh the ordinances touching outwarde gouernement and ceremonies, to be no matters of faith, neither writtē at all. Surelie this is strange diuinitie. It is an ordinance not onely concerning the inward, but also the outward gouernment of the Church, that Christ is Lord and King thereof: Is it therefore no matter of faith? It cōcerneth the outward gouernment, whether the Pope be (vnder Christ) head of the church or no? Doeth it not therefore concerne faith? Publique prayer, preaching of the Word, and hearing of it preached, administration and receyuing of the Sacraments, are matters concerning the outward gouernement and orders of the Church: doe they not therefore touch faith? Admonition and exhortation concerne also the outwarde gouernement of the Church, doe they*

" 1 Tim. 3. 10 15. & 5. chap. & 6. 13. 14. Tit. 1. 5, &c. Act. 1. 3. & 2. 40. &c. & 6. cap. & 14. 23. & 15. cap. and 19. 9. & 20. 7. 17. 28 Rō. 12. 6. 7. 8. Ephe 4 11. 12. 1 Thes. 5. 12. 13. 14. Phil. 1. 1. 5. Heb. 3. 1. 2. 3. & 13. 17. Iam. 5. 14. 1 Pet. 5. 1. 2. 3. 1 Cor. 4. 17. & 5. cap. & 9. cap & 11. cap. & 12. cap. & 14. cap. and 16. 1. 2. Gal. 6 1. 6. 2 Thes. 3. 6. 12. 14. 15. Mat. 18 15. 16 17. & 28. 18. 19. 20.

they not therefore concerne faith? Finally, by this diuinitie, the Sacraments of Baptiſme and of the Lordes ſupper, being ceremonies, ſhalbe no matters of faith at all amongſt them.

But here they ſtay not, but adde moreouer, That the outward orders, gouernement, and ceremonies of the Church, bee arbitrarie at the appointment of the Church and Magiſtrate, and not certen nor written in the booke of God. *Whervpon it followeth, that it is not certen nor taught in the ſcriptures, but arbitrarie at the Churches & Magiſtrates pleaſure: Whether Chriſt, or the Pope of Rome or of Caterburie, be head and Archbiſhop of the Church of God: Whether Iewes onely of the tribe of Leui, may nowe miniſter the holy things of God in his Church: Whether Chriſt haue giuen any giftes, and ſet any offices in his Church for the Miniſterie and guidance thereof: Whether prayer muſt bee in a knowne or vnknowne tounge: Whether the teaching and ruling Elders be to be had and honored: Whether the church may excommunicate: Whether the Popes, or any other Prelates excommunication be to be regarded: Whether there be two, or three, or ſeauen Sacramentes: Whether the Paſſeouer, Circumciſion, and other ceremonies and ſacrifices of the Lawe, be now to be vſed: Whether the Heatheniſhe ſacrifices and worſhip be to bee ioyned withall: Whether creame, oyle, ſalt, ſpitle, croſſing and coniuring, be to be vſed in Baptiſme: Whether the bread onely and not the cup, is to bee giuen to the lay people (as they call them:) Whether holy water, holy aſhes, holy palmes and ſuch like, be of the holy things of the church: Whether the Iewiſh and Popiſh veſtimentes, faſtes, and holy dayes are to be obſerued: and a thouſande ſuch like, which are all of them, concerning the outward orders, gouernement, and ceremonies of the Church. By theſe mens Diuinitie, theſe and infinite ſuch like, are vnwritten and vncerten, but left onely to the pleaſure of the Church and Magiſtrate. Moreouer, if it pleaſe them, the Princes and ciuill Magiſtrates may them ſelues be the publike miniſters of the worde, Sacraments, and cenſures of the Church: any that will may without a calling take vpon him to bee a publique officer in the church: Women may baptiſe, or adminiſter the Lords ſupper: The Iewiſhe, Romiſh, or Heatheniſh prieſthood may be retayned: Auricular confeſſion may be vſed: The Keyes of the kingdome of heauen, may bee appropriated to the Pope of Rome, or the Prelate of Canterburie, or any other whom ſoeuer: The Prelates and their Officials excommunications do binde in heauen: The Apochriphall bookes and Decretall epiſtles are canonicall ſcriptures: The Popes Portuis and the Engliſh booke of prayer taken out of it, are the true and lawfull worſhip of God: The Prelates and Prieſtes are the true and lawfull Miniſters of God: Orders, pennaunce, extreame vnction, matrimonie, &c. are the Sacramentes of the Church:*

Cap.

Cap, Surplis, Cope, Tippit, Rotchet, &c. are ornamentes of the Miniſterie. Finally, all ragges and trumperies of the Romiſh religion, are good and lawfull, if it pleaſe the Church and Magiſtrate. For why? They concerne the outward gouernement, orders and ceremonies of the church: And touching them (ſay theſe men) Chriſt hath not left any ordinances written, certen, or perpetuall, but left them at the arbitrarie appointment of the Church and Magiſtrate. Is not this ſtraunge Diuinitie? Yet they ſtay not there neither, but as men that haue bent their tongues like bowes for lyes, they feare not to adde moreouer, that when the Church and Magiſtrate appointeth anie ordinances, (whether theſe or any other) touching the outward gouernement & ceremonies of the Church, we are to account them to be Chriſtes owne ordinances, who hath left this libertie to the Church for to vſe. O ſhameles mouth: O vnchriſtian hart: Can any Papiſt or Atheiſt ſay more? or can any deſire a more euident proof then this, that theſe men and aſſemblies thus holding, profeſſing, and practizing (as here them ſelues affirme) can not in this eſtate by the word of God, be deemed true Chriſtians and Churches. 6. *Sixtly, obſerue howe yet moreouer they ſeeke ſhiftes, & would colour the matter, pretending* That the thinge which concerne outward gouernement and ceremonies, are not of the foundation ſimply. *But this will helpe them no more then the other. For firſt we aſke, are they of the foundation at all, though not ſimply? If they be, then ſeeing they are not written, not certen, nor perpetuall (as heere is affirmed) it will followe, that neither the whole foundation is written certen, or perpetuall: neither the Apoſtles were faithfuull and ſkilfull maiſter builders in the laying thereof. If they be not, then why is this worde (ſimplie) added, as if they graunted that they were of the foundation, though not ſimplie as they ſpeake. Secondlie wee aſke, whether the outwarde gouernement and ceremonies ordeyned by Chriſt for his church vnder the Goſpell, be not of the foundation, aſmuch as the outward gouernement and ceremonies appointed by Moſes for the Church vnder the law? Or if they be, whether they are not as faithfully ſett downe by Chriſt, as the other were by Moſes, and as carefully to be obſerued by vs, as the other were by the Iewes, or rather much more, inaſmuch as Chriſt the Son is worthy more glorie and honour, then Moſes the ſeruant. Thirdlie we aſke, what foundamentall pointes Moſes and Aaron with the reſt of the Iewes ioyning with them, helde: that* Corah, Dathan, Abiram, *and their companions held not: Differing from them and erring only touching the Prieſthood and Miniſterie which concerned the outward orders & gouernement of the Church: was therefore Corah, Dathan, Aviram, and their companies in that eſtate the true Iſraell of God? Or were not the*

Heb. 3. 2. 3.

other

other truthes they helde by this meanes frustrate and of none effect vnto them? Nay, were they not therefore wholy to be separated from, and left to the iudgement of God, which ouertooke them and all that ioyned vnto them? Yet was their error onely in matters of order and outward gouernement of the Church. This may suffize to conuince the aduersaries vntrue assertions in this place. To that of Maister Cranmer and Ridley &c. is answered before. Num. 16.

For conclusion therefore, this we adde, concerning this point. That all such assemblies and people, as holde, professe, and practise, (as doth the Church of England) these abominations following: They can not by the word of God, be esteemed in such estate trulie to holde Christ, their Prophet, Priest, and King: To wit, The confusion of all sortes of people (though neuer so wicked) and their seed in the body of the Church: The offices and callings of other Archb. and Lordb. then Iesus Christ: also of Archdeacons, Chancellors, Commissaries, Officials, Priestes, halfe Priestes, Parsons, Vicars, Vagrant and Mercinarie Preachers, &c. The entrance into the Ministerie by an other way, and by other Lords, then Iesus Christ: The executing of it vnder those strange Lords, & leauing it at their pleasure: The preaching of the word, administration of the Sacramentes, and gouerning of the Church, by vertue of the offices and callings aforesaid, & according to the Popish Canons and constitutions: The power of Excommunication in the Prelates alone and their Officialls: The confounding of Ciuill and Ecclesiasticall offices and authoritie in the Ministers of the Church: The forbidding of Mariage at certen seasons: The imposing and vsing of stinted deuised Liturgies: The English Portuis, taken out of the Popes latine word for worde (saue that a fewe of the grosest thinges are left out) yet keeping the same frame and order of Collectes, Psalmes, Lessons, Pater nosters, Pistles, Gospels, Versicles, Respondes, &c. Appointing holy dayes to all Saintes and Angels, to the Virgin Marie, Iohn Baptist, Marke, Luke, and twelue Apostles seuerallie: togeather with Fastes on the Eaues and on Ember dayes, Fridayes, Satterdayes & Lent: Prescribing the Ministers to pray ouer the dead, ouer the Corne and Grasse at some seasons of the yeere, and ouer Women at their Churching or purification: Ioyninge them also to marie with the Ring, which they make a sacramentall signe: And to Baptise likewise with the signe of the Crosse, with Godfathers and Godmothers, with questions demanded of the infant that can not speake nor vnderstande: Giuing power, to Women to baptise: And ordeyning that the other Sacrament of the Lords Supper be celebrated kneeling, as when they receyue their maker: and with change of the wordes of Christes institution, taking in steed of them, the wordes of

the Popes Maſſe booke, tranſlated into Engliſh, &c. Finallie, the vpholding of theſe and all ſuch amongſt them onely by carnall weapons, of impriſonment, death, confiſcation of goods, baniſhment, and ſuch like. The aſſemblies (I ſay) and people which holde, profeſſe, and practize (as doeth this Church of Englande) the abominations aforeſaid, concerning the outward order and gouernement of the Church, what ſoeuer truethes they holde beſides, yet can they not by the word of God, be deemed truely to hold the Lord Ieſus, their Prophet, Prieſt, and King, in ſuch conſtitution of a church. Neither therefore can they in this eſtate by the word of God be accounted true Chriſtians, nor the true conſtituted churches of Chriſt: & this is the queſtion betweene vs and our aduerſaries. 7. Laſtlie, let the godlie and indifferent Reader iudge, whether it will not followe vppon this anſwere in this place: Firſt, that the [a] Scriptures are not ſufficient for the building vp and guidance of the Church here on earth: Secondlie, that the [b] men of God can not by the Scriptures be made abſolute and fullie furniſhed to euery good worke: Thirdlie, that [c] Chriſt him ſelfe in whom the treaſures of wiſedome and knowledge are hid, yet was ſo fooliſhe, careleſſe and vnfaithfull, as hauing an houſe and kingdome (which is his Church) he hath not in his word appointed vnto it, anie offices, lawes and orders, for the due gouerning and ordering thereof: Finallie, That the [d] Hierarchie, Worſhip, Sacramentes, Traditions, Canons, and whatſoeuer conſtitutions of Antichriſt, concerning the outward orders and gouernement of the church, being appointed by the Church and Magiſtrate, are to be accounted Chriſtes owne ordinances: O ſhameles impietie: Doubtles this is that ſame ſtrange paſſion, and meere deſperatnes, wherewith afterwarde vniuſtlie they charge vs: which we will not proſecute, as it deſerueth, but exhort them onely, to take heede leaſt that woe come vppon them whiche is written: Woe vnto them that ſpeake good of euill, and euill of good: which put darknes for light, and light for darknes: that put bitter for ſweet, and ſweet for bitter. Woe vnto them that are wiſe in their owne eyes, and prudent in their owne ſight, Eſa. 5. 20. 21.

7.
a Contrarie to 1. Tim. 3. 15. 2. Tim. 3. 16. Deut. 12. 32. 1. Corin. 4. 6. Reu. 22. 18, 19
b Contrarie to ℣ 2. Tim. 3. 17 ℣ 1. Tim. 3. 15. Pro. 2. 1. 9. Pſal. 119. 105. 13.
c Contrarie to Col. 2. 3. Heb. 3. 1, 2, 3. Eſay. 32. 22. Ephe. 4. 11. 12. 13. 1. Cor. 11. and 12. and 14. Rom. 12. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Mat. 28. 20. 1. Tim. 6. 13, 14.
d Contrarie to the 2. Cor. 6. 14, 15, 16. Pſal. 94. 20. & 119. 21. 113. 128. Reu. 9. 1, 2, 3, and 14. 9, 10, 11.

H. IACOB his 2. Reply to the 2. Excep.

IN this your defence of your ſecõd Exception, it pitieth me to ſee your extreame folly: which is the more miſerable, becauſe it appeareth to be not of weaknes, but of wilfulnes. You would know of vs *if we hold Chriſt to be our Prophet, Prieſt and King, and if we profeſſe to obey him in his own ordinances and in no other.* I anſwered, we doe conſtantly profeſſe ſo, and as we profeſſe ſo wee practiſe. But to make our profeſſion & practize in this poinct more manifeſt, I noted how our ſtate meaneth Chriſt to be our Prophet, Prieſt and King, and how hee is to be obeyed viz. That the written word ought of neceſſitie to ſhew vs our inward and meare

meare ſpirituall beleif & obedience. As for the outward Church order, our ſtate holdeth that it is arbitrary to bee appointed and abrogated againe at the liking of the Church and Magiſtrate, And that the worde no where forbiddeth this libertie: Where note in this explication two thinges.

Firſt, it is foule wrong to our Churches and to my wordes, to ſay as you doe, *That they meane, no outward orders at all, be matters of faith, or conſtant in the Scriptures.* Nay it was neuer doubted, but to preach, to pray to adminiſter Sacraments &c. though externall, yet are perpetuall things and neceſſarie and vnchangable by the Scriptures. My expreſſe wordes, and our Churches meaning is, That any reaſonable kinde of Church-gouernement, and rites, and orders, are arbitrary and changeable, no matters of faith, nor written in the Scriptures; And yet ſtill Chriſt to be our only, and abſolute King & Prophet neuertheleſſe. Whoſoeuer doth vrge vpon our Churches further, or on my wordes; doth ſlaunder and cauill, and malitiouſly depraue them and nothing elſe.

Secondly, note in my explication, that I iuſtifie not this opinion of our ſtate, but I ſay; Thus to beleeue and practize, *ſimply*, deſtroyeth no mans ſaluation in Chriſt, which you denying generally and vehemently, in your ſixt anſwer, You deny directly Maiſter *Cranmer, &c.* to haue held the foundation, or to bee ſaued: wherein, you openly profeſſe and proclaime, that ſecond generall poinct which in the beginning I charged you with: That all Churches and Chriſtians here in Kinge Edwards time, and namely *Maiſter Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Philpot, Saunders, Rogers, Tayler. &c.* held not Chriſt their Prophet, Prieſt and King, and ſo conſequently they were lims of Antichriſt (for they bare his marke euen to their deaths) and no true Chriſtians. Alas to ſee how malice and preiudice hath blinded you. Is there not greater cauſe for vs to cry & ſay againſt you, *O ſhameleſſe mouth, ô vnchriſtian heart*, which termes, you vainely charge vpon me? Is this you that white the Toombs of thoſe Martirs, and yet in fine, condempne them for no true Chriſtians, nor their Aſſemblies for Churches?

You adde a clauſe, *They that profeſſe and practize as doth the Church of England, &c.* If you meane hereby to put a difference, betwene thoſe good mens holding this opinion, and our Churches nowe, Yea betwene your owne lately, and ours now, ſpeake out, what is it? Yow can imagine none but this. Thoſe good men Maiſter *Cranmer, Ridley, &c.* and your ſelfe of late, held theſe very ſame errors of the outward Church order which wee doe; But they and you, did (it ſeemeth) of ſimplicity, we malitiouſly: they of ignorance, wee of plaine obſtinacie, and hauing a conuicted and ſeared conſcience: whereby, they & you might be true Chriſtians for all theſe errors, but we now cannot be ſo. If this be your meaning,

ning, then you graunt vs our Assumption, against which all your dispute here is bent. You graunt it I say, That the whole doctrine, as it is by law in England, is sufficient to make a perticuler man a true Christian. Secondly *wee now erre not in these points of simplicitie, but of wilfulnes and malice.*

Say you so? Speake that plaine then. Our whole assemblies? all and euery of our assemblies? of wilfulnes and of a conuicted conscience? Are you sure of this? Doe you knowe euery mans heart and conscience so well? If you doe, then you say somwhat indeed. But you are then neere as wise as God himselfe, to know mens hearts so perfectly, whose faces you neuer saw; You will say, you know diuers, whom you dare say are conuicted in cõscience. That is much also to affirme. But if you doe, that serueth not your turne, vnlesse all be so conuicted. Christ knew a great many in the Church of the *Iewes*, yea of the learnedst and chiefest in authoritie, that were conuicted in conscience, that he was the Christ, who blaspheamed in denying him, And yet the Assemblies then where not conuicted, they still were true Churches. Wherefore in this saying, if you say to the purpose, you then affirme the Third generall point that I noted in you at the beginning of this my last Reply: That euery soule in England is conuicted in conscience.

But here I maruell that you say, *Maister Hus and others of the holy Martirs did heare and say Masse till their dying day, Also that others did acknowledge the Popes supremacie.* I aske you, doe you meane that they held and vsed the Popish Masse, according to all the abominations that are in it? If you thinke so, then surely neither *Hus*, nor any of the rest, were *holy* Martirs. For therin are founde errors plainely fundamental, which of them selues abolish from Christ; They are not to be compared to our publike errours now in England, The like I say of the Popes supremacy. If you thinke any of the Martirs acknowledged it in the large and ample meaning therof, as the Popish Doctors doe set it down; Then verily neither were they any Martirs. The booke of Acts and Monuments whither you send vs, affirmeth not that they held these errours in the largest and grossest sort. It may be therefore they held manie and greuious errors of ignorance, both in the Popish Masse and in the supremacy, which might neuertheless stand with Christ crucifyed, And so they might be & were holy Martirs: But I affirme, that according to the damnable grossenes of the very Papists, they neither did nor could hold them. Therefore in these instances you say nothing to vs, nor against the question in hand.

Further, you said before in the beginning of your defence of this Exception, *That Master Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer and the rest of the Martirs then, neither had them selues, nor ioyned in spirituall communion, with such as had the Prelacy, and Ministery now pleaded for.* Now I see you make no conscience of vntruthes, yea you are bold to auouch open and known falsehoods. Did not Maister *Cranmer* hold himselfe for Archbishop still, and that hee was by the Pope vniustly and vnsuffici-

* Pag. 13.

ſufficiently depoſed, and by Queene Mary forcibly reſtreyned from it? Did he euer repent of holding that Office till his death? Alſo did not *Ridley* ſtand vpon his right to the Biſhoprick of London though ready to die? *Latimer* though he renounced his Biſhoprick, yet he kept his Miniſterie, and neuer repented him of it. *Philpot* neuer miſliked his Arch deaconry: Yea when he refuſed bloudy *Bonner*, Yet he appealed to his ordinary the Biſhop of Wincheſter. The like minde is to be ſeene in Biſhop *Farrar*. And generally whoſoeuer were Miniſters then of the Prelates ordination, they neuer renounced it, though they died Martirs. Thus appeareth your bould vntruth in this behalfe.

Further in your Sixt anſwer Pag. 16. Firſt you will not ſee what I meane in ſaying, That theſe outward orders bee not of the foundation ſimply: I meant, not at all of the very *foundation, neither are they. Secondly you aske *if our outward orders vnder Chriſt be not fundamentall aſwell as the Iewes vnder the Law*, I anſwer, neither were the Iewes outward orders of the very foundation, without which they could not be ſaued. Thirdly you aske *how Corah, &c. differing from Moſes and Aron only about the Prieſthood and Miniſterie, were ſeparated from, and damned.* I anſwer, not that the matter was fundamentall, but the manner was rebellious, with conſciences a thouſand times conuicted, and ſo donne with a high hand againſt God him ſelfe.

* 1 Cor. 15. 2, 3, 4. Rom. 4. 25. 1. Cor. 3. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.

But now this conſidered, How vainely doe you charge mee in your entrance into this Excep. pa. 13. *That I & others of my minde, goe about to iuſtifie theſe matters of order in controuerſy, by Cranmer, Ridlies and Latimers example, and their Congregations then.* For ſhame doe you not ſee the cõtrary, that I call them *errors*. I onely iuſtifie by their exãple that theſe corruptions aboliſh vs not from Chriſt, as theirs did not, And that I truſt is ſound. Which thing alſo you might haue remembred, if you had ben ſo charitable, by that which I wrote in " another place.

" In the next treatiſe following, of the cõpariſon of the Miniſtery with Mariage: Anſ. to your firſt Reaſon.

Then in your firſt anſwer, Pag. 14. Howe vainely doe yow aske vs for Scriptures to proue thoſe orders, ſeing I expreſly called them *errors*. 1.

The like in your Second, wher you load vp Scriptures to diſproue thẽ. 2.

Alſo Thirdlie, you charge an vnconſcionable vntruth on mee (if you meane this anſwere vnto me) *that I ſhould graunt and cannot deny, that all outward ceremonies and gouernement, are arbitrary at mans pleaſure:* I onelie ſaid, that our ſtate holdeth that generall opinion, Not that I my ſelfe held it, If you meane them, write to them, and ſpeake to them, if you meane me, you doe me foule iniurie. 3.

Fourthly, *whether they are Popiſh ſhiftes or no*, let our ſtate, which mainteyneth theſe things, anſwer you. 4.

Your Fift is anſwered in ỹ firſt poinct of my explication noted before. 5.

pag. 19. To your Sixt in pag. 16. wee aunſwered before in the Second poinct of my explication pag. 19. 6.

Your Seuenth in pag. 18. is alſo againſt the ſtate of our Church, and not againſt me.

Maiſter IOHNSONS 3. Exception againſt the former Aſſumption: with Maiſter *IACOBS* Replies to the ſame.

EXCEPTION 3.

THirdlie, let them ſhew by the Scriptures, howe the 36. Article of their doctrine & booke alleadged, agreeth with the Goſpell of Chriſt and true Chriſtianitie.

The words of the Article are theſe as followeth.

The Booke of conſecrating of Archbiſhops and Biſhops, and ordering of Prieſtes and Deacons, doth conteyne all thinges neceſſarie to ſuch conſecration and ordering, neyther hath it any thing that of it ſelfe is ſuperſtitious or vngodly. And therefore whoſoeuer are conſecrated or ordered according to the Rytes of that booke, we decree all ſuch to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully conſecrated and ordered.

Moreouer, how it agreeth with the Goſpell and true Chriſtianitie, That Apocripha bookes and the booke of Homilies, be read in the church by the Miniſters diligentlie and diſtinctlie. As is in Art. 6. and 35. of that doctrine and booke aforeſaid.

H. IACOB his 1. Reply to the 3. Excep.

YOur third Exception is this. That the 36. Article of ordaining Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons. Alſo the reading of Apocripha bookes and Homelies in the Church, *agree not with true Chriſtianitie: Ergo, the Aſſumption aboue is falſe, that is, the whole doctrine of that booke of Articles is not ſufficient, to make vs true Chriſtians.*

I anſwer, you ſhould haue ſaid, thoſe poincts deſtroy vtterly true Chriſtianity, Ergo, &c. Elſe the Argument followeth not: But then we deny flatly the Antecedent or firſt part of the reaſon. But your Reaſon you will ſay ſhall goe as you haue put it. Then marke theſe reaſons euen as good as yours and all one. An Ethiopian is white of his teeth, therefore he is a white man. A Swanne is black of his bill, therefore a Swanne is black. My brother hath an eye of glaſſe, or he hath a wodden legge, therfore my brother is no true man.

F. IOHNSON his Deſence of his 3. Excep.

OVr third Exception was this. Whereas they referred vs to their booke of Artieles 1562. We required that they ſhould ſhew by the Scriptures how the 36. Article there mentioned, which is of the booke of conſecrating Archbiſhops and Biſhops, and of ordeyning Prieſts and Deacons: And howe alſo the 6. and 35. Articles of that booke, enioyning the Apocripha bookes and Homilies, to bee read in the Church by the Miniſters diſtinctlie and diligentlie. Howe theſe, I ſay, doe agree with the Goſpell of Chriſt, and true Chriſtianitie.

Now

Now I pray you, haue they ſhewed vs theſe things by the Scriptures, as we deſired: nothing leſſe. Firſt therefore marke this heere and euerie where alſo in their reaſons and anſweres, that though wee call neuer ſo much to them for proofe and euidence from the Scriptures, yet they neuer bring it, but labour to put it off with other ſhiftes & deuices of their owne: As if our conſciences were to be built vpon their fancies, and not vppon the written worde of God. But what doe they ſay to our demaund? Firſt they tell vs, Theſe thinges doe not vtterly deſtroy true Chriſtianitie. *Secondly, they graunt notwithſtanding, that they agree with it as blacke doeth with white, that is, they are cleane contrarie vnto it: For this their ſimilitudes doe import. Nowe whereas they alleadge,* That theſe thinges deſtroy not true Chriſtianitie, *We anſwere, That euen that Hyerarchie, worſhip, conſtitution, and gouernement, which they profeſſe and practize (as appeareth by thoſe and other their Articles and iniunctions in our former anſwere alleadged, to which yet we haue receyued no aunſwere) being directly Antichriſtian, doe vtterlie deſtroy true Chriſtianitie. ſo as* Nota *the people and Churches ſo profeſſing and practizing, can not in that eſtate by the worde of God be iudged true Chriſtians, or the true conſtituted Churches of Chriſt. And touchinge* the ſimilitudes here vſed, *beſides that which we haue noted before, we adde moreouer, that they are not againſt vs, but againſt them ſelues, in aſmuch as comparing the doctrines of the Goſpell, which they profeſſe, with the whitenes of an Æthiopians teeth: And their Antichriſtian Miniſterie, Worſhip, Courtes, and confuſion of people, with the blackenes of an Æthiopians body. This and ſuch like ſimilitudes doe fitlie declare their eſtate. And the approouing of the black conſtitution of their church Aſſemblies, by ſome white doctrines of the Goſpell which they profeſſe: Is euen as if they ſhould reaſon thus: An Æthiopian is white of his teeth: therefore he is a white man. A blacke Rauen is white of his bill: Therefore a blacke Rauen is a white bird.*

H. IACOB his 2. Reply to the 3. Exception.

YOur Third Exception is, *That the 16. Article of cõſecrating Biſhops & Prieſts, and the 6. and 35. Artic. of Apocripha and Homelies, doe not agree with the Goſpel.*

What then? Ergo, our Churches profeſſion and practize differ. Moſt falſe: For our Churches doe profeſſe, that theſe things doe agree with Goſpell well enough: Alſo their practiſe is thereafter, Or doe you conclude, Ergo our Churches holde not Chriſt to ſaluation. In deede ſo I tooke your purpoſe at the firſt: but nowe in plaine categoricall termes you auouch it, *That theſe things being directlie Antichriſtian, doe vtterlie deſtroy true Chriſtianitie.* So then *Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, &c.* were verie Antichriſtes, and no true Chriſtians. As before alſo, I trowe, you affirmed.

Surely

Surely, this grosse and wicked absurditie, I could not open better then by this similitude: This man hath a wodden legge, an eye of glasse, his nose deformed, adde if you will, both his armes not naturall, but framed to him of wood or what you will: Ergo this is no true man. Yes Sir, for all this he is a true man. For as much as all this concernes not the verie life and being of a man, though these be most vnnaturall additions, and very manie. The like doe I affirme of these externall corruptions in the Church: Which my sentences you goe not about to refute, but onelie with wordes, with bare yea, and nay, and no more.

Mr Iohnsons I. REASON against the former Assumption: with Mr Iacobs Replies to the same.

HAuing before noted 3. Exceptions out of their doctrine and booke alleadged: we nowe proceede to shewe the weakenes of their Assumption aforesaid, by these 9. Reasons following.

REASON I.

THat which ioyneth Christ and Antichrist togeather, can not make a true Christian, 2 Cor. 6.14,15,16. with Ezech. 43.8. and 2. Kings 17.33,34,40,41.

BVt that doth the doctrine and booke alleadged, as may be seene by comparing the 35. and 36. Articles with the rest. And furthermore it appeareth both by their profession, which is to be seene in their booke of Cannons set foorth anno 1571. and in other their Articles, Iniunctions, Aduertisements, &c. published at other tymes, and by their practize also, which is to be seene in their Ministerie, Worship, and Church gouernement euen to this day:

Therefore, &c.

H. IACOB his 1. Reply to the 1. Reason.

THis your first Reason is thus: *That which ioyneth Christ and Antichrist togeather, can not make a true Christian: But that doth this Booke, Ergo, &c.*

I say you must mende your vnproper speache, that Christ and Antichrist is there ioyned togeather, you meane Christ, and some outward ceremonies and orders of Antichrist: then so speake, and say not Christ and Antichrist simply. Which things yet we thinke to be Christes own,

as we

as we shewed in the Second Exception before. Therefore, this reason is answered as the last Exception before. The Swanne is blacke of his bill, *Ergo*, the Swan is blacke, and my brother hath a wodden legge: Therfore my brother is a wodden man. So here this booke ioyneth Christ and some orders of Antichrist: Therefore it ioyneth Christ and Antichrist togeather, which are most fonde conclusions. *Pag. 12. 18. 19.

Furthermore, the scriptures alleadged 2 Cor. 6. Ezek. 43. 2. Kings 17. are wholy mismatched, the ioyning there forbidden, is vnto such idolatrie, as can not stande by any meanes with Christian faith, and breaketh most directlie the First commandment: Our transgression your selues do iudge to be but against the Second, and such as hath stood and may stand togeather with true faith as in Maister *Cranmer*, &c. * They did not so much as professe the written lawe to be their rule, neither for outwarde orders, nor their inward doctrines of faith. But your selues knowe, we professe and practise that, namely, so as is shewed before in the Seconde "Exception. Therfore to applie those scriptures in this vnto vs, is your great sinne euen against the third Commaundment, which is your common custome, as all doe see and pitie, viz. *To take the name of God in vaine, by misusing his worde.* * Namely, the Idolaters in those places spoken of. " Pag. 11. 18.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 1. Reason.

His answere here is First concerning the Proposition of this reason, then concerning the Assumption: Concerning the Proposition: First he saith, Our speach is vnproper, that Christ and Antichrist is there amongst them ioyned togeather. *Secondly, he taketh vpõ him to expound our words and meaning to be thus,* Christ and some outward ceremonies and orders of Antichrist. *To this we answere: First, that it is meete that we (not he) expound our owne meaning, whiche togeather with the proprietie of the speech, will afterwards appeare in our defence of the Assumption against his answere thereto. His answere therefore concerning the Assumption is this: First,* That the things among them which we charg to be of Antichrist, they thinke to be Christes owne: *For proofe whereof, he referreth vs to his answere to our Second exception going before, whether also we referre the Reader for answere to him againe. Secondly, forgetting him selfe,* he graunteth that in deed they be orders of Antichrist: yet that they are but as the blacknes of the Swannes bill to the rest of the body. *Well then by his owne confession they are of Antichrist, and therefore not Christes owne, as before he saide and laboured to proove. Thus at once both he contradicteth him selfe, and ouerthroweth that which he answered* "*before to our Secend exception.* 1. * Pag. 18.

This were sufficient to manifest their deceiptfull and euill dealing: But that it may more fullie appeare, specially seeing hee would dazell the peoples eyes with these minting wordes (of some outward ceremonies & or- 2.

ders of Antichrist, comparing them with the blacknes of the swans bill) as if they were but a fewe, and of small moment, Therefore will we reckon vp some of their Antichristian enormities and abhominations (for it were infinite to nomber them all): And then let the Reader iudge of his answere and their estate, whether it be not more like the blacke Rauen with a white bill, then the white Swanne with a blacke. Sorie we are that we should thus trouble the Reader, or our selues: specially considering that alreadie we haue mencioned diuers of the particulars following: But seeing we are constreyned hereunto by their sly and colourable answere in this place, therefore can we not but doe it, for the clearer manifestation of the trueth, & better discouering of their deceiptfulnes. In which respects we intreate the Reader also, to take in good parte, and duely to weigh the repetition and recapitulation following.

Antichristian abominations yet reteyned in England.

1 The cōfusion of al sortes of people in the bodye of their Church, euen the most polluted and their seede beeing members thereof.
2 The offices and callinges of Arch L. Bishops.
3 Lord Bishops.
4 Suffragans.
5 Prelates Chaunceliours
6 Deanes
7 Subdeanes
8 Prebendaries
9 Cannons
10 Petty cannons
11 Chaunters
12 Virgerers
13 Pistlers
14 Gospellers
15 Queristers men and boyes
16 Organistes
17 Organ Blowers
18 Arch deacons
19 Subdeacons
20 Deacons, or half priests
21 Priestes
22 Parsons
23 Vicars
24 Curates
25 Vagrant & Mercinarie Preachers
26 Churchwardens
27 Clerkes and Sextons
28 Chaplaynes
29 Doctors of Diuinitie
30 Bachelours of Diuini.
31 Doctors and
32 Proctors in the Prelates courtes
33 Commissaries
34 Officialls
35 Registers
36 Summoners with the rest of that Antichristian and Superous generation
37 Their Ministration of the word, Sacramentes, & gouernment of their church by vertue of the offices aforesaid
38 The titles of Primate, Metropolitane, Lordes grace, Lordship, &c. ascribed to the Prelates.
39 The inferior Prelates swearing obedience to the Metropolitall seas of Caturburie & York.
40 The inferiour Ministers when they enter into the Ministerie promising obedience to the prelats their ordinaces: and when they are inducted to benefices, confirminge it with their oath
41 The Deacons and Priests presentations to a Lorde Bishoppe by an Archdeacon
42 Their receyuing of orders of the Prelates, or their Suffragans
43 Their Pontificall, or Booke of consecratinge Bishops, and of ordering Priestes & Deacons, taken out of the Popes Pontificall, where their abuse of scripture to that

ende

ende, their Cellell, Pistles &c. may be seene

44 Their making and being made Priestes, with blasphemie, the Prelates saying to them whom they make Priestes, Receiue the Holie Ghoste, whose sinnes ye forgiue, they are forgiuen, &c.

45 Their confoundinge of Ciuill and Ecclesiasticall offices and authoritie in Ecclesiasticall persons

46 Their receyuing and vsing in their publike worshippe, the Apocrypha Bookes, whiche haue in them diuers errours, vntruethes, blasphemies, & contradiction to the canonicall scriptures

47 Their stinted prayers, and Leetourgie, taken out of the Popes Masse booke, with the same order of Psalmes, Lessons, Collectes, Pater Nosters, Pistles, Gospels, Versicles, Responds, &c.

48 The Crosse in Baptisme

49 The Hallowed Fonte, Questions to the Infants at Baptisme

50 The Godfathers and Godmothers promisinge that the childe doeth beleeue, forsake the Deuill and all his workes, &c.

51 Weomans baptizinge of children: which maintayneth that heresie, that the children are damned, which dye vnbaptised,

52 Their houselinge of the sicke, and Ministring the communion to one alone

53 The Ministring it, not with the wordes of Christes institution, but with others taken out of the Popes Portuis

54 Their selling that Sacrament for two pence, to all commers

55 The receyuing of it kneeling, which maketh it an Idoll, and nourisheth that heresie of receyuinge their maker, of worshipping it, &c.

56 Their Ring in Mariadge, making it a Sacrament all signe, and Mariadge an Ecclesiasticall action: thereby nourishinge the Popishe heresie, that Matrimonie is a Sacrament

57 Their praying ouer the dead, makinge it also a parte of the Ministers duetie, and nourishinge the heresie of prayer for the dead

58 Their churching or purifying of Women, then also abusing that Scripture, The Sunne shall not burne them by day, nor the Moone by night

59 Their Gang weeke, and prayinge then ouer the corne and grasse

60 Their forbidding of mariage in Gang weeke, in Aduent, in Lent, and on all the Ember dayes: which the Apostle calleth a doctrine of Deuils, 1 Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3.

61 Their Sanctes, Angells, and Apostles dayes, with their prescript seruice

62 Their fastes, and abstayning from flesh on their Eaues, on Frydayes, Saturdayes, Ember dayes, and all Lent through

63 Their dispensations from the Prelates courts of Faculties, to eat flesh at these tymes: Which dispensations also haue this wholesome clause in them, sana conscientia, (that is, with a safe conscience:) plainelie shewing, that they make it a matter of conscience. This is another doctrine of Deuills, noted in the scripture before alleadged 1 Tim. 4.

64 Their Dispensations in like manner to marry in the tymes among the forbidden, which are noted before

65 Licenses from the same authoritie, to marrie in places exempt

66 Dispensations also from thence for Boyes and ignoraunt fooles to haue benefices

67 Dispensations likewise for Non residents

68 For hauing Two, Three Foure, or more benifices, euen tot, quot, that is to saye, as manie as a man will haue and can geite.

69 Tolleration
70 Patronages of, and presentatiõ to benefices with buying and selling of aduousons
71 Their institutions into benefices by the Prelates, their Inductions, Proxes, &c.
72 Their suspensations, absolutions, degradations, deprivations, &c.
73 The Prelates Chauncellours, and Commissaries courtes, hauing power to excommunicate alone, & to absolue
74 Their penance in a white sheete
75 Their commutation of penance and absoluing one man for another
76 The Prelates confirmation, or Bishoping of children, to assure thē of Gods fauour, by a signe of mans deuising
77 The standing at the Gospell
78 The putting off the cap, and making a legge when the worde Iesus is read
79 The ring of peales at burials
80 Beadmen at buriall, & hyred Mourners in mourning apparell
81 The hanging & mourning of churches & heerses with black at burials
82 Their absoluinge the dead, dying excommunicate before they can haue (as they say) christiã buriall
83 The Idoll Temles.
84 The Popish Vestiments, as Rochet, Horned cap, Tippet, the Surplise in parishe Churches, & Cope in cathedrall churches
85 The visitations of their Lord Bishops and Archdeacons
86 The Prelates, Lordlie dominion, reuenues and retinew
87 The Priestes maintenance by Tithes, Chrismes offrings, &c.
88 The othes ex officio in their ecclesiasticall courts, making men sweare to accuse them selues
89 The Church Wardens othe to present to the Prelates, all the offences, faultes and defaults committed in their Parishes, against their Articles and Iniunctions.
90 The Prelates rulinge of the Church by the Popes cursed canon lawe
91 Finally, their imprisoning, banishing, such as renounce and witnes against these abominations aforesaid, and the rest yet retayned among them.

Thus being constreyned, we haue repeated and reckoned vp diuers of the Antichristian enormities still remayning & practised in their church: By which the Reader may better see and iudge, both of the sleightnes of their answere in this place, and of the blacke constitution of their church. As also comparing these and the booke by him alleadged togeather, it may hence appeare that our speach is proper, and fitlie declaring their estate, when we saide they ioyne Christ and Antichrist togeather: And therfore his answere in this place to be friuolous and of no weight.

Next he commeth to the proofe of our Proposition, which was confirmed by these scriptures, 2 Cor. 6. 14, 15, 16. With Ezek. 43. 8. & 2 King. 17. 33, 34, 40, 41. The Proposition which we proued by these Scriptures, was this.

That which ioyneth Christ and Antichrist togither, can not make a true Christian.

Nowe let euen the aduersaries them selues iudge, Whether these Scriptures doe not so euidentlie proue this Proposition, as none can denie it, but such

such as are wilfully blinded, and strive against the light of their owne cõsciences But what saith he of these scriptures here alleadged? Forsooth That they are wholy mismatched. And why so? Because the ioyninge there forbidden, is vnto such Idolatrie, as can not stande by any meanes with Christian faith, and breaketh most directlie the First commandement: whereas their transgression is but against the Seconde, and may stande with true faith, as he supposeth in Cranmer, &c. First, this answere of his, concerneth our Assumption, whereas those scriptures were the prose of the Proposition. But to let this passe, let vs consider the answere it selfe, howe worthy and clerklike it is. These scriptures (he saith) forbid ioyning to such Idolatrie, as can not stande with Christian faith, and breaketh most directlie the First commaundement. 1. If this were so, what then? Doe they not therfore forbid ioyning to Antichristian idolatrie, and that false worship which breaketh the second cõmaundement? 2. Secondlie, he can not denie, but as we iudge of their way and estate, so it is a transgression against the Second commaundement. Nowe, Samuell saith, Rebellion is as the sinne of witchcraft, and transgression is wickednes & idolatry. 1 Sam. 15. See then what advantage he getteth by his owne answere? 3. Thirdly, as the Pagans Idolatrie breaking the First commaundement, cannot stand with true christian faith, so neither can the idolatrie and false worship of Antichrist breaking the seconde. To that of Maister Cranmer, &c. is alreadie answered in pag. 13. whereunto may bee added, that their case nowe, is nothing so as theirs was then: both for that they suffered to death for the trueth which they sawe, And because the things nowe controuerted, were not then so called into question and conuinced against them by the scriptures, as nowe they haue ben against these: neither were then by them so resisted and persecuted as they are by these men now adayes, euen vnto bandes, banishment, and death it selfe: Otherwise we might iustifie the callings and estate of the Monkes and Fryars, and of the most Popish Priestes and Prelates, and the hauing communion with them in that estate, because diuers such haue ben Martirs, and layd downe their liues for the trueth which they sawe, who yet neuer doubted of the lawfulnes of their callings and estate in this behalfe, which then were not so called into question, nor convinced by the scriptures, to bee vnlawfull, as since they haue bene. 4 Fourthlie, as there is a double Idolatrie and false worship the one against the First commaundement When any haue others besides the true God for their God: the other against the Second commaundment, when anie hauing the true God for their God, yet worship him not as hee hath commaunded, but after the inventions and prescriptions of men: So also these scriptures alleadged, and the whole course of the word of God, condempneth the ioyning and hauing fellowship with either of these, as-

well this which is against the Second commaundement, as that whiche is against the First. See the Reasons alleadged by the Apostle:* Are they not stronge and weightie against ioyning togeather righteousnes and vnrighteousnes, light and darknesse, Christ and Beliall, whether it be in the breach of the First or Second commaundement? Saieth not the Lord there, That his Church is his Temple, in which he dwelleth and walketh, and therefore requireth of them that they be his people, his sonnes and daughters, separated from the world, and touching no vncleane thing: whether it be of Antichrist against the Second, or of the Heathen against the First commaundement? And touching the place of Ezekiell, who seeth not, that he speaketh directlie of the breach of the Second commandement, in ioyning togeather in the worship of the true God, their thresholdes with Gods thresholds, and their postes with Gods postes, that is, their inuentions with Gods ordinances: which though it bee done to the name and for the seruice of the true God, yet sayth the Prophet, It is abomination in the sight of God, and they that doe so worship him, set a wall betweene God & them selues, and defyle his holy Name with their abominations. Loe here the vse and fruict of ioyning togeather the inuentions of men (chieflie of Antichrist that man of sinne) with the ordinances of God in his worshipp and seruice. As Maister Iacob and his complices like this, so let them holde on in pleading for it, and practizing of it. The third place alleadged, is out of 2 King. 17. where also it is most plaine, that the scripture speaketh of the breach of the Second cõmaundement. For there is set down that the Samaritans worshipped the [b] same God, and after, [c] the same manner that the Israelites of the Tenne Tribes did, that were carryed from thence: That is, they worshipped the [b] true God, but [c] not as hee had commaunded, but by hauing Images of sundrie sortes, by whiche they thought God was represented, as [d] of olde they thought of the calfe that Aaron made, and by other inuentions deuised by the Israelites in their defection, and ioyned to Gods ordinances for the worship and seruice of him. That this was the sinne of those Samaritans against the Second commandement, will appeare, by cõparing togeather with this chapter, these scriptures following, to which we referre the Reader, Ezra 4. 1, 2. with Exod. 20.4,5,6. and 32. 1,4,5,6. Iug. 17.2,3,4,5,13 Ezek 20. 39. Hosea 2. 16. Amos 5.21,22,23. & 8.14. 1 Kings 12.27. and 18.21. and 21. 29. and 22. 12,24. Esay 10. 11. Iohn 4.19,20,25,26,29,30. By these also, as by that of Ezekiell likewise may appeare, howe false it is, that hee further saith, They did not so much as professe the written law to be their rule, neither for outwarde order, nor their inwarde doctrines of faith. If this were so, howe could it bee true, which Ezechiell sayeth of them, of whom

* 2 Cor. 6.14. &c.

Ezech. 43. 8.

2 King. 17.

b Vers. 28. 32 41.

c Vers. 26. 27, 29, 33, 34, 40.

d Exod. 32, 4.

whom he speaketh, that they set their postes and thresholds by Gods postes and Tresholds, that is, their inuentions by Gods ordinances. Howe also was it that the Samaritans, spoken of 2 King. 17. sacrificed to the true God, euen the Lord God of the Iewes, offering vnto him burnt offringes, and meate offringes, and peace offringes? Or howe came it, that they still vsed circumcision, and weyted for the Messias to come, as he was promised in the writen worde of God: yea knowing also and beleeuing, not onely that the Messias would come which is called Christ, but also that when he came he would tell them all things? The Corinthian infidels in deed, as the rest of the Heathen, knewe not the true God, nor his written worde. But it was not so with the Samaritanes or Tenne tribes of Israell fallen from Iudah, as is euident by the scriptures and reasons before alleadged. To that which he next addeth to their professiō & practise: Referring vs to his answere in pag 11,12,18 to our Second Exception going before, wee haue there answered alreadie, pag. 12. 13. and will not therfore repeate it.

Onely this we adde moreouer, That seeing the publique constitution of their Assemblies, and estate of their Ministers & people therein, is a most impious transgression of the Second commandement, which the Lord himselfe calleth " spirituall whoredome against him, yea grieuous iniquitie and hatred of him, threatning † to visit it vpon the Fathers and children so remayning, to the Third and Fourth generation: Therefore both by it are the truthes which they professe, made frustrate vnto thē in this estate. Neither will it helpe them to pretend that it is their error in iudgement, (For what abomination is there that might not thus be coloured?) But seeing their publike profession & practize is (at the best) a ioyning of Christ and Antichrist togeather, as hath bene shewed before, therefore neither can they by the worde of God be deemed in this estate, to bee true Christians, or true constituted Churches. And the Scriptures applyed to proue this consequent, are fitlie alleadged, as hath bene seene. Falsly therefore it is, that he sayth, We sinned against the Third commaundement, in the application of the scriptures aforesaid. That is their owne common custome, and lamentable sinne, to breake the Third commaundement, in taking the name of God in vaine, not onely by falsifying and peruerting the scriptures, but also by their Ministration of the Word, Sacramentes, and Gouernment of the Church, by vertue of such offices and callings as Christ neuer appointed in his worde therevnto, but were first deuised, and still are reteyned by Antichrist, that sonne of perdition. Hitherto of his answere concerning the proofe of our Proposition. 4.

" Num. 15. 39 Reue. 11. 8. & 17. 1, 2, 3, 4.
† Exod. 20.

" Marke this his founde and Sclolerlike dealinge in this place and afterwards.

To the proofe of our Assumption, he " answereth not a worde: which yet most of all required answere, if he would in deede soundlie defende their

their estate, as he pretendeth. That their profession and practise ioyneth Christ & Antichrist togeather, we shewed in pag. 28 &c. by their Articles, Canons, Iniunctions, Aduertisements, &c. published at sundry times, & by their present Ministerie, Worship, and Church-gouernement, according thereunto. If this be not so, why bringes he not warraunt for these particulers from the Testament of Christ, and so take away the proofe of our Assumption? If this be so (as by his silence he graunteth and we are sure he cannot shew the contrarie by the Scriptures) then our Assumption standeth firme, and consequently in this constitution, they cannot be accounted true Christians, nor their Assemblies so gathered, true constituted Churches.

H. IACOB his 2. Reply vnto the 1. Reason.

IN this your defence of your first Reason, *you would first of all fasten on me a contradiction, for graunting, that our Church corruptions are from Antichrist, which against your Second Exception, I said wee holde to be Christs owne, viz. Because we hold, Christ hath giuen his Church that libertie to deuise them.* Alas it pitieth mee to see your simplicitie, or it greueth me for your malice; who could not see, that there
[a] See Pag. 12. 18. 19. I spake in the person of our whole Church and state, and shewed what they held: And here I speake as I thought my selfe. This is a silly contradiction.

2. Then you say, Pag. 25. *I dazell the peoples eyes, in saying some outward orders and ceremoines are from Antichrist as if they were but a few and of small moment.* Therefore you are content to recken them vp full tediously God knoweth euen 91. in number: *numero Deus impare gaudet.* And what of all these; will you saye therefore, That whosoeuer holdeth these, cannot holde Christ vnto saluation. And so Mr. *Cranmer* and the rest of the Martirs were damned. But if not: Then I saye againe, These some, these 91. are too few and too slight, and of too small momēt of them selues and of their owne nature to abolishe vs from Christ. This ought you to haue proued, which you neuer doe, but still your speech is most false and not vnproper onely, *that wee ioyne Christ and Antichrist togeather:* As in the maimed mā before noted,
[c] Pag. 35. there is not life & death ioyned togeather, but liuing things and dead things are, and yet the man aliue and a true man.

3. Then "*you will iustify your applying the scriptures* which I said were
[a] 2 Cor. 14. &c Eze. 43. 8. [b] King. 17. 33. 34. 40. 41. mismatched & were meant against the Idolatry of the First commandment, not against the Idolatry of the Second only, and meerely, as our Church orders in question are. Therefore these scriptures cannot inferre any abolishing from Christ by simple holding of the corruptions in our Church: which they doe proue by the simple holding of those Heathenish Idolatries, whereof they speake. To this you reply in Foure points.

(1) If

(1) *If these places bee meant of Heathenish Idolatry, which could neuer stand with Gods truth togeather: Yet they forbid all other corruptions against the Second commaundement also.* That I neuer denyed to be true after a sort. These places indeed doe forbid the breach of the Second cõmaundement, but not principally, directly and of purpose, nor in that measure or fulnes. But their immediat purpose is against the Heathenish Idolatry breaking the First commaundement. So that they forbid the breach of the Second commaundemẽt, consequently and proportionatly, but not in that full manner as they doe the First, They forbid the First so as that they shew there is no communion with God, whilst men ioyne in such Idolaty: they simply forbid the Second, but deny not al communion with God to whom soeuer erreth therein. (2) To your Secõd Reply I say, make much of it, for my parte, I neuer thought other but our church corruptions are against the Second commaundement: your second scripture here applied, is of *Saul*, a presumptuous and wilfull offendour: if you make our whole Churches so, your sinne is the greater. 1. Sam. 15.

(3) Thirdlie, if you meane, anie of Antichristes Idolatrie and false worship, and namelie this in question (the outward corrupt orders and ceremonies onely and no more) doeth abolish vs from Christ, and that this can not stande togeather with true faith, like as the Pagans idolatrie against the First commaundement, can not. Then I denie it vtterlie, you haue no proofe in the world for it. And this inwrappeth Master *Cranmer, Ridley, &c.* in the same course. Your excuse here pag. 29. *That Cranmer, Ridley, &c. forsooke all the corruptions they sawe.* This belongeth to manie Thousands in England nowe, no lesse then to them: yea surelie there are infinite, that knowe not so much of the corruptions, as those learned men did, which yet are not ignoraunt of redemption by Christ, &c. Yea your selfe Maister *Iohnson*, though a man of learning, yea knowing our corruptions, and misliking them a long time before you forsooke vs, yet I thinke you stood not abolished from Christ all that while. I pray bee so good to poore men, as you may: yea to vs nowe also, aswell as to your selfe and them in those times. Where you say, pag. 29. That *since that time we are conuicted by the scriptures*. If you meane some fewe, that here and there you could pick out, and doe sinne still, speake to them, threaten them: throwe out your damnatorie sentence against them, But smite not all whosoeuer comes neare you: Beware howe you iudge, least you be iudged: The heart belongeth to God, therefore censure not euerie mans conscience too hastilie. 4 Fourthlie, you would prooue in your Third Exception before noted, pag. 29. *That both the breach of the First commaundement, and of the Second also, is forbidden.* I haue tolde you before, pag. 32, 33. howe it is true, and howe not: Nothing at all to serue your turne.

That which you say, pag. 30. touching your first scripture, 2 Cor. 6. 14 &c. in that sence and maner as I saide, is true, and not otherwise. That 2. Cor. 6. 14.

Ezek. 43. 8. which of your Second ſcripture (Ezek. 43. 8) pag. ibid. you ſay, *Who ſeeth not but it ſpeaketh directlie of the breach of the Second Commaundment, ioyning togeather in the worſhip of the true God their inuetions with Gods ordinances*, I ſay it is moſt manifeſt, that he ſpeaketh not of the breach of the Second Commandement onely, but alſo of the firſt, wherein men haue their inuentions alſo. The Prophet ſheweth verſ. 4. and 7. That God returned to his Temple againe, whence he was departed for the abominable idolatries that had ben there committed before, to ſhew that he would reſtore Ieruſalem, and the Temple, and worſhip of God againe. He meaneth this literally, of the returning of the *Iewes* after *Babilons captiuitie*, and of the reedifying of the Temple, and the appointing againe of Gods holy worſhip there: Alſo ſpirituallie he may meane, the erecting of the Chriſtian Church whe they ſhould not fal to ſuch impieties as the Iewes had done nowe in that time before, for the which he had departed away from them. Nowe if we aſke, what were thoſe Idolatours in Ieruſalem and in the Temple before Ezekiels time, for the whiche the Lord forſooke them: it is manifeſt in *Ahaz*, in *Manaſſes*, and *Amon*: and in the Kings after *Ioſiah*, That the *Iewes* idolatrie was verie Heatheniſh, not onely againſt the Second, but againſt the Firſt Commandement alſo, in ioyning the Heathen gods with the true God of Izraell in their Diuine ſeruice and worſhip: Therefore this place of Ezekiell, is (as I ſay) Not of the breach of the Second commandment onely & ſimplie, as our church corruptions are, but ioinctlie touching the breach of the Firſt alſo. The
2 King. 17. verie ſame is that your Third ſcripture pag. 30. 2 Kings 17, 33, 34, 40, 41 of the Samaritans Idolatrie, wherein becauſe you are large, I will deferr to explaine it till your Sixt Reaſon following: where is a proper place for it.

4 Laſtlie, in pag. 31. *you agrauate the breach of the Second Commandment, as being ſpirituall whordome, &c.* But I would haue you to know: Things may be miſmatched too cruelly, as well as too gentlie. There is a ſinne both wayes, when things are not called by their proper and right names. Is it true in ſome ſence, euery breach of the Second Commandement, is ſpirituall whordome, as euery wanton word, euery light geſture and countenance, euery immodeſt thought in a Woman, is Adulterie: yet who ſo ſhall angerlie and continuallie ſo call a woman whore, harlot, or baude, that but thinketh, or looketh, or ſpeaketh too vainly, ſhall doe her great wrong, and incurre the iuſt daunger of lawe. Neither can ſhee, notwithſtanding in ſuch caſe, be reported, as an Adultereſſe ought. And thus it appeareth true ſtill, that you ſinne againſt the Third Commaundment in miſapplying of ſcriptures.

In the ende in pag. 31. where you ſaye, *To the proofe of your Aſſumption I anſwere neuer a worde, which moſt of all required anſwere.* This I tell you, that it is your fancie and not my meaning heere, to anſwere to your Propoſition firſt, and then to your Aſſumption to ſay nothing. Nay, if you had not dreamed, you might eaſilie haue perceyued

that

that all my first wordes (viz. where I say your speech here is vnproper &c.) are bent directly against your Assumption and the proofe thereof, although at this time I expressed not those termes. Secondly, I shewe, that your scriptures applyed to proue the Proposition are altogither vnfitt, and intollerably abused, if you meane them in that sence as your Assumption must be meant, that is to say, as they touch vs. This, a verie childe might haue seene, Maister Iohnson. So that your marginall scoffe at my sound and schollerlike dealing, doeth light on your self, and bewrayeth eyther your deepe skill or your ouerflowing charitie. As for the rest, *that I should iustifie our corruptions*, it is no part of my minde, neither belongs it to our present cause so to doe.

Maister IOHNSONS II. Reason against the former Assumption: with Maister *IACOBS* Replies to the same.

REASON II.

THat which appointeth and ratifieth the worshipping of God in vaine, That cannot make either true Christians or true Churches.

But the doctrine publikely professed and practized by law in England, appointeth and ratifieth the worshiping of God in vaine. Therefore, &c.

Of the trueth of the Proposition, none can doubt: And the Assumption is thus proued.

That which appointeth and ratifieth the worshiping of God by the precepts of man: That appointeth and ratifieth the worshiping of God in vaine. This Christ affirmeth out of Esay the Prophet, Mat. 15. 9. compared with Esay. 29. 13.

But the doctrine publiquely professed & practized by law in England appointeth and ratifieth the worshipping of God by the precepts of man. This appeareth by the 35. and 36. Article of the booke alleaged, And by their booke of Comon prayer, their Fastes, Feastes Holy dayes, &c. which are executed by their Popish Courts and Officers. All which are authorized by Law in England.

Therefore the doctrine publiquely professed and practized by lawe in England, appointeth and ratifieth the worshiping of God in vaine. And consequently cannot make a particuler man a true Christian, nor the assemblies so gathered together, true Churches.

H. JACOB his 1. Replie to the 2. Reason.

THis your Second Reason is. *This booke and others appoincteth and ratifieth the worshiping of God in vaine, Ergo &c.* 1. This also hath answere in the third Exceptiō Pag 22. 2 Also, note I pray you, this Scripture [Mat. 15.] is verified of such as were thē of the true visible ✠ Church, with whom Christ and his Apostles, both in Christes time and after his death, did sometimes ioyne and comunicate. This therefore maketh for vs and against you most notably.

✠ Marke his open contrarietie with him self, graunting this in Reas. 6.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 2. Reason.

OVr Second Reason is as you see: now what proposition doth he deny? Truely none at all. What defence bringeth he of their booke of cōmon prayers, and the particulers therein: Of their Prelacie, & other Ministerie receiued from them according to their booke and Pontificall: Of their Canons and Excommunications, &c. Surely none. What then doth he answere? Forsooth he referred vs to his anuswer before in the last exception. Whether also we referre the Reader with this note, that there he shall finde nothing, either for aunswer of anie proposition of this argument, or for defence of their false worship, Prelacie, Ministerie, and Church gouernement called into question. Is not this then a worthie and Clercklike answere? And haue not these men (thinke you) good proofe for their present estate and Church constitution: Which thus leaue it altogeather without defence, euen when it most needeth, and as it were, beggeth their help and succor, if they could affoard it anie. But now hauing no aunswer to any parte of our argument, yet hee bids vs note, that this Scripture (Mat. 15.) here alleaged, is verified of such as were then of the true visible Church, with whom Christ himself and his Apostles both in Christs time, and after his death, did somtime ioyne and cōmunicate. This therfore he saith maketh for them and against vs most notably.

1 *But first let him tell vs: if many* ** *thinges, which are verified sometimes of the members of a true Church, may not also fitly be applyed, and alleadged against a false Church, and yet not iustifie their estate and constitution, neither make for them, but against them altogeather. Otherwise he condemneth at once all the Martirs heretofore, who vsually alleaged this* * *very Scripture against the false worship of the Romish Church, as him selfe cannot he ignorant. Yet in his learning it seemeth the Papistes might well haue aunswered the Martirs againe, that this Scripture was verified of them that were of the true visible Church, and therefore made for them, and against the Martirs most notably.*

** As that of Leu 10. Num. 16. 1. &c. Esa. 1. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. Zeph. 1. 12. 1. Cor. 11. 19.

* Mat. 15. 9.

2 *Secondly, when he saith,* this Scripture is verified of such as were of the true visible Church with whom Christ and his Apostles communicated: *Let him also tell vs, whether he meaneth that Christ and his Apostels*

ſtels communicated with them in their vaine traditions. If he thinke they did, that very * Chapter ſheweth the contrary: beſides that the whole Scriptures teſtifie, that Chriſt was altogeather free from ſinne, which hee could not haue bene, if he had ioyned with them in thoſe their inuentions. If they did not, (as it is without all queſtion) then what doth this helpe thoſe men, who all of them ioyne and communicate with the falſe worſhip of theſe aſſemblies? * Mat. 15. 2.

3 Thirdly, we aunſwer, that his note is not worth the noting, being nothing at all to the purpoſe for the queſtion in hand. For firſt, who knoweth not, that in the Iewiſh Church, the doctrine publiquely profeſſed & practiſed by their law, did not appoinct or ratifie any of thoſe vaine traditions, but vtterly forbid them? Whereas contrarily, the very doctrine publiquely profeſſed and practized by law in England, appoincteth and ratifieth the falſe worſhiping of God by the inuentions of men: Secondly, thoſe vaine traditions aforeſaid, were the perſonall ſinnes of ſome particuler men in the Iewiſh Church not publiquely eſtabliſhed by law, nor generally receiued and practized in that Church: * Zachary and Elizabeth, Simeon, Anna, Mary, Ioſeph, and Chriſt him ſelfe, and his Apoſtles, with many others, kept the ordinance of God giuen by the hande of Moſes, and obſerued of that Church. Neither did they ioyne or pollute them ſelues with that vaine worſhip aforeſaid: whereas in the church of England, the falſe worſhip thereof deuiſed by men, euen by that man of ſinne, is not the perſonall ſinne of ſome particular men in it, but is publikelie eſtabliſhed by law, and generally receyued and practiſed in theſe aſſemblies, of all the members thereof. So then this ſcripture maketh nothing for them, but againſt them moſt notably. * Luk. 1. 5, 6, 8, 9, 10. & 2. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27. 36, 37, 38, 39 Mat. 15. 7. & 8. 4. and 15, 2. Ioh. 10. 34.

Nowe, whereas in the margent, he wiſheth the Reader to marke a contrarietie with our ſelues, by comparing this and our 6. Reaſon together: we alſo referre it to the Reader to iudge, whether there be not euen an harmonie with this, and a confirmation of it. Hetherto of the defence of our ſecond Reaſon.

H. IACOBhis 2. Reply to the 2. Reaſon.

TO this your defence of your Second Reaſon, I ſay, you haue anſwer in your laſt Exceptiõ, pag. 22. You aſke what Propoſitiõ I doe deny? I anſwer, I diſtinguiſh your Aſſumption as being a fallacie called ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ τινὰ, ἁπλῶς τὸ ἁπλᾶς: cõcluding a thing ſimply, from that which is after a ſort, like vnto that Reaſon which I framed againſt you in Pag. 22. A man hath a woodden legg, an eye of glaſſe, &c, Therefore hee is no true man. Cranmer, Ridley, &c. held aſmuch as wee, after mens precepts; Ergo,

they worshiped in vaine. *Geneua* holdeth her wafer cakes in the Supper. Ergo, *Geneua* worshipeth God in vaine. Euen so your Assumption runneth. *Our doctrine* (say you Pag. 35.) *appointeth Gods worship by mens precepts.* This is false, vnlesse you meane it κατα τι, after a sort, not simply. For our doctrine appointeth not all Gods worship by mens precepts, nor the chiefest part of it: as the preaching of the Gospell of life, Sacramentes, and Prayers, &c. So that it concludeth nothing in that sence. Therefore here you play the false Sophister, not the Christian and conscionable Disputer. Thus you haue answer enough to this in the aunswer to your last Exception, though you would not see it.

*Pag. 35. Further I noted Secondly, That this your Scripture of Mat. 15. Yeeldeth the offenders to be of a visible Church, with whom Christ did communicate, though they held also traditions of men: Therfore it affirmeth nothing against vs. Is not this true? Why then doe you not admit it? We neuer denyed, but this Scripture condemned our corruptions: But this onely wee affirme, it disanulleth not our Churches: Euen as Christ here condempned the Iewes corrupt traditions, but hee meant not thereby to disanull their Church. Therefore all this is not against our purpose, but notably for vs as is before obserued.

1. Concerning your First aunswer in Pag. 36. I know this Scripture may be applyed against false worshippers which are no true Church: But it proueth not I say, all them, to whom it may bee applyed, to bee no true Church: Therefore you abuse it against vs, Except you had first proued vs no true Church nor Christians, which yet is in question.

*Pag. 37. 2. Where in your Second answere * you say *That this helpeth vs not, except we say that Christ communicated with the Pharisies in these traditions, like as wee doe in the vaine traditions now.* For shame leaue this folly. I say againe, I seeke not to iustifie our partaking in our traditions, but I renounce it in sobrietie asmuch as you, yea better then you doe: Yet I say this place shall admit those who doe in simplicitie partake of them, to be true Christians neuertheless, like as it admitteth the Iewes then.

et Pag. ibid. 3. In your Third aunswer, "You deny that those Iewish traditions of washings, &c. were with them receiued generally, or by Law in their Church. Whereto I aunswer, That they were generally receiued, as Marke in his 7. Chapter and 3. verse doeth testifie, and that they were rebuked who vsed them not: which is sufficient to make it their Churches doctrine & practize, though no expresse law commaunded it. But I suppose verse 5. where they say, [*Why walkest thou not after the tradition of the Elders*] he meaneth, the ordinances of their Forefathers, which were to them as lawes, besides the lawe of Moses. What else is their *Thalmud*, which is till this daye, euen like to the Canon lawe of Poperie, and the *Alcoran* of Turky. Some also vnderstand this of the ordinances of the Elders, that is, their present Gouernours: and then doubtlesse it was lawe. And though *Zacharie, Elizabeth, Symeon, Anna, Mary, Ioseph, Christ and his Apostles*, did not actuallie ioyne in these corruptions, yet they were generall no doubt, and by lawe

lawe neuer the lesse, and a number of the Iewes simply vsed them, & yet fell not from God, as † Iohn 2. 6. Therefore your Replies here are most vaine and false.

† The Sixe waterpots of the Iewishe purifyngs.

Lastlie, in pag. 37. you will not confesse your contrarietie, that is to saye, betweene this your Second Reason, and certen wordes in your Sixt Reason. But the greater is your sinne, to doe euill, and defende it too. Here in this Reason pag. 35. you would haue this scripture Mat. 15. to be meant against such vaine worshippers, that they become heereby no true Church: (Or els what doe you vrge it against vs?) But in your Sixt Reason following, you say, *That the Iewes, euen nowe when these words were applyed to them, were the true worshippers of God.* Are not these contrarie, I pray you, then reconcile them.

Maister IOHNSONS III. Reason against the former Assumption: with Maister *IACOBS* Replies to the same.

REASON III.

IF the whole doctrine, as it is publiquely professed and practized by law in Englande, be not sufficient to make a Galatian a true Christian, *that should with all submit vnto Circumcision: Then much lesse, is it able to make him a true Christian, that togeather with it, submitteth vnto a false Ministerie, Worship, and Gouernement, of the Church deuised by man, euen the man of sinne. But the first is true: Therefore also the latter.*

The consequence of the Proposition is good, because Circumcision was once the holy ordinance, and appointment of God himselfe to his Church and people, whereas the Ministerie, worship, and gouernement aforesaid, neuer was so, but is mans deuice in religion, euen Antichrist, that capitall enemie of Iesus Christ.

The Assumption is proued Gal. 5. 2. 3. 4. where the Apostle speaketh of them that helde, not onely such truethes of the Gospell, as are in that booke of Articles, but more then those: Yet if they should with all submit vnto circumcision, he sayth, they were abolished from Christ, Christ would profit them nothing.

H. IACOB his I. Reply to the 3. Reason.

THis your Third Reason is from the more to the lesse negatiuelie to this effect, *A Galatian vsing Circumcision, is a likelier Christian,*

then

then one of our Englisſh holding the Hierarchy and other traditions: But *A Galatian is a falſe Chriſtian, Ergo, An Engliſh profeſſor is much more.*

We anſwer, We denie the Aſſumption: *Galatians* were then true Chriſtians, and their Aſſemblies true Churches, Gal. 1. 2. Therefore this Reaſon is nought. If he obiect, *The Apoſtle ſaith, ſuch are abolisſhed from Chriſt.* That is in deed ſome amongſt them, as helde Moſes ceremonies, † Gal. 5. 3. 4. 5 Rom. 10. 3. 4. neceſſarie abſolutelie to ſaluation, as Act. 15. 1. And that † iuſtification was by the morall workes of the law. Nowe the Churches of *Galatia* generallie were not ſuch, but held the ſauing faith ſound doubtles, though manie amongeſt them were tainted with that infection, by reaſon of ſome miſcheuous teachers that were crept in, and too well interteyned among them. Howbeit, with the Church, Communion was kept, And therefore, ſo with vs you ought to deale. If you ſay, we are worſe Chriſtians then thoſe groſeſt *Galatians*, It is vtterlie falſe: proue it if you can, and it muſt drawe in Maiſter *Cranmer*, &c. with vs alſo. If you ſay, there are manie amongſt vs as bad, or worſe then thoſe worſt *Galatians*, you may ſay it, but proue it, you cannot. Alſo, if it were ſo, yet this diſgraceth, it deſtroyeth not the Church, like as hath bin ſaid of the *Galatians*.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 3. Reaſon.

TO this our Third Reaſon, His Firſt anſwer is, That he denyeth the Aſſumption: *which is aſmuch in plaine termes, as if he had giuen the holy Ghoſt the lye, who by the Apoſtle Paule affirmeth it, Gal. 5. 2, 3, 4. As in the proofe of the Aſſumption we ſhewed before. But for the more euidence of the trueth, we will ſet downe the proofe of the Aſſumption in a Sillogiſme, thus:*

If a Galatian ſubmitt to Circumciſion, though he hold all the truthes of the Goſpell profeſſed in England withall, yet be notwithſtandinge abolisſhed from Chriſt, and falne from grace, Then is he not in this eſtate a true Chriſtian.

But the former is true, as the Apoſtle teſtifieth, Gal. 5. 2, 3, 4.

Therefore alſo the latter.

Next he anſwereth, That the Galatians were then true Chriſtians, and their Aſſemblies, Churches, Gal. 1. 3. Therefore *(ſayeth he)* this reaſon is nought. *But he may not thus runne away with the matter and deceyue him ſelfe and his ſimple fauourers. The queſtion is not, whether anie Galatians were true Chriſtians, or any of their Aſſemblies, true churches. For who euer doubted of that? But this is the queſtion: Whether a Galatian holding all the truethes of the Goſpell nowe profeſſed in Englande, and withall ſubmit to Circumciſion, were in that eſtate a true chriſtian*

ſtian. Or putting the caſe that there were whole Aſſemblies conſiſting of ſuch: Whether thoſe aſſemblies then in that caſe were by Gods Worde to be deemed the true churches of Chriſt. The Apoſtle teſtifieth and ſaith, no: This man ſaith, yea. Nowe whether of theſe two we ſhall beleeue, let all men iudge. But what is it then that the Apoſtle termeth the aſſemblies of the Galatians true churches? Gal. 1. 2. This man ſheweth the reaſon him ſelfe, the light of the trueth is ſo cleare and manifeſt. There were but ſome of the Galatians (ſayth he) that were infected with this error of Circumciſion. True in deed (ſay we) & of ſuch onely is the ſuppoſitiõ made in the caſe afõreſaid. But the churches of Galatia (ſayth he) generally were not ſuch, but held the ſauing faith ſound: which alſo is moſt true, they being ſet in the way and order of Chriſt Ieſu: and therefore though there ſprang vp ſome heretikes and ſchiſmatikes amongeſt them (which is the " lott and triall of the true churches of God in all ages) yet was there not cauſe to breake the Communion with thoſe aſſemblies, but to proceed with them in the faith, and order of Chriſt, and to * cutt off and caſt out ſuch troubleſome leauen from amongſt thẽ. Now this being duely weighed, it is nothing for, but altogeather againſt, the hauing of communion, with the aſſemblies of this Lande, which are not ſet in the way and order of Ieſus Chriſt, (as were thoſe churches of Galatia) but in the Apoſtaſie and confuſion of Antichriſt, as hath ben at large declared before, in the defence of the former Reaſons, where alſo that of Maiſter Cranmer, Ridley, &c. is anſwered.

" 1 Cor. 11. 19 Acts 20. 30.

* Gal. 5. 12. 1 Cor. 5. 7, 11, 13.

H. IACOB his II. Reply to the 3. Reaſon.

TO this your Defence of your Third Reaſon, I anſwer. Firſt it is too impudent a cauillation " That you charge me to giue the H. Ghoſt the lye, in denying your Aſſumption. I meant not your Aſſumption, but that which I had made briefer, conteyning the effect of yours. This was the Aſſumption denyed by me, But a Galatian is a falſe chriſtian. As he that hath but halfe an eye may ſee.

Secondly, to ceaſe needles ſtrife. I deny therefore your Propoſition. Though a Galatian * holding circumciſion, cannot bee a true Chriſtian, yet an Engliſh Chriſtian holding the Hyerarchie &c. may. The Reaſon of this denyall I gaue you then, but that you would not ſee it: Namelie, becauſe ſuch Galatians, held Iuſtification by the works, and ceremonies of the Law. Gal. 5. 3. 4. 5. Rom. 10. 3. 4. Act. 15. 1. Like the Papiſtes, who by their ceremoniall and morall workes doe hold the ſame, and ſo doe erre Fundamentally. But our Churches and ſtate, hold not the Hyerarchie ſo, but only as an indifferent thing in it ſelfe. This blaſphemous opinion of Circumciſion, maketh it infinitelie worſe, (though once it

* that is, So holding it, as ſ worſt did, or els this is a ſophiſticall Equiuocation.

was ordeined of God) then our indifferent opinion of the Hyerarchie, though in deed it were neuer but nought.

Thirdlie and laſtlie, you haue no where cleared Maiſter Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, & the reſt of thoſe holy Martirs, from being aboliſhed from Chriſt, if the Hyerarchie be ſimply worſe then Circumciſion, ſo held as thoſe Galatians did hold, Gal. 5. 2, 3, 4, 5.

Maiſter IOHNSONS IIII. Reaſon againſt the former Aſſumption: with Maiſter *IACOBS* Replies to the ſame.

REASON IIII.

THe doctrines of faith conteyned in that Booke alleadged, would not make him a true Chriſtian who holding them, ſhould alſo ſtill execute or ioyne vnto the Miniſterie of Mahomet, that open Antichriſt and enemie of Ieſus Chriſt. 2. Cor. 6. 14, &c.

Therefore neither can they make him a true Chriſtian, that holding them, yet doth ſtill execute or ioyne vnto, the Miniſterie and worſhip of the man of ſinne, the couert Antichriſt and enemie of Ieſus Chriſt.

H. IACOB his 1. Reply to the 4. Reaſon.

THis your 4. Reaſon is *Mahomets Miniſterie and Antichriſtes Miniſterie are both bad alike.*

But the good doctrines of our booke of Articles cannot ſaue a man that ioyneth alſo to Mahomets Miniſterie.

Ergo, the good doctrines of that booke cannot ſaue a man that ioyneth alſo to Antichriſtes Miniſterie: which thing we in England doe.

I deny neither the Propoſition, nor Aſſumption: And yet the Argument is too bad. It is a fallacie of *Equiuocation*, as wee call it: Wee muſt therefore diſtinguiſh: *Mahomets* Miniſterie, and *Antichriſts* Miniſterie, haue a doubtfull meaning. If you meane, the whole function and exerciſe of publique worſhip performed in *Mahomets* or *Antichriſtes* aſſemblies, that is, in the Turkiſh or Popiſh Churches: Then I graunt your whole argument is * true. But that we doe ſo in England, (which comes in the concluſion,) Or that any Chriſtian amongſt vs thinketh ſo: That I vtterlie deny. And thus indeed, that Scripture alleadged 2. Cor. 6. 14. is rightly vnderſtood. But if you meane by Miniſterie, the outward manner of calling to the Miniſterie, & ſom outward ceremonies, vſed by Mahomet, or the

* Both are nought alike as touching aboliſhing vs from Chriſt.

or the Pope: Then I flatly and abſolutely deny your Aſſumption, and your Scripture is anſwered before in the Firſt Reaſon. For I affirme, and it is manifeſt: That ſuch errors being ioyned with the good doctrines of that our Booke, doe not deſtroy faith, and true Chriſtianitie, As before was ſhewed in the Second Exception.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 4. Reaſon.

HEre the light of the trueth doeth ſo dazell the Anſwerers eyes, as he freelie confeſſeth he can not denie any whit of our Reaſon. And yet forſooth the Argument is too bad. *But why ſo?* There is *(hee ſayth)* an equiuocation in it, and therefore he will diſtinguiſh. *But Firſt wee* 1.
tell him, there is no equiuocation at all in the words, but they are al plain, to him that hath a ſingle eye, and will vnderſtand the trueth. Therefore his diſtinction heere is idle & friuolous. Yet ſee alſo betweene what things he doeth diſtinguiſh: Forſooth betwene the whole function and exerciſe of publique worſhip perfourmed in the Turkiſh or Popiſh Aſſemblies, and betwene the outward maner of calling to their Miniſtery, and the outward ceremonies vſed amongeſt them.

*An abſurd diſtinction touching the matter in hande: For firſt, who knoweth not, that theſe latter are of the very ſame nature with the former: Are not their outward callings and ceremonies falſe, Anticriſtian, & accurſed before God, aſwell as the reſt of their worſhip and ſeruice? Or hath God in his worde giuen any commaundement more for theſe then for the other? Secondly, who ſeeth not, that the argument here, is not of whatſoeuer thing is vſed among the Turkes and Papiſtes, but of the Miniſterie and worſhip which they haue deuiſed and executed: As in particular, of the publique offices of Miniſterie reteyned among them, of their maner of calling, and entrance into them: of their adminiſtration of them: of their ſtinted impoſed Liturgie: their eccleſiaſticall gouernement, cannons, proceedings, &c. All which in the church of England are taken out of *that golden cuppe of abominations, whereby Antichriſt, That man of ſinne, hath made the Nations of the earth to be drunken: as may appeare by coparing their Pontificalls, Canons, and conſtitutions togeather. If this man will needes be otherwiſe minded, then let him proue the particulars aforeſaide, by the Teſtament of Jeſus Chriſt.*

* Reu. 17.4,5 2. Theſ. 2.3,4, 7,8,9,10, 11, 12.

Furthermore alſo, marke here, that he graunteth, the doctrine of faith 2.
conteyned in their booke of Articles, cannot make him a true Chriſtian, that holdinge them, doth withall receiue and ioyne vnto the publike worſhip, perfourmed in the Turkiſh or Popiſh Aſſemblies. *This he ſaith he graunteth as moſt true. Wherevpon it followeth, euen by his owne confeſſion: Firſt, that ſuch thingh then may be ioyned with the doctrines of*

faith receiued among them, as they in ſuch eſtate cannot be deemed true Chriſtians, or true Churches, Neither the truthes which they holde, be anaylable to them. Secondlie, that therefore the Propoſition of his Firſt and mayne Argument, is not generall, but admitteth limitation, & ſo his greateſt defence is of no weight, as before is ſhewed in the beginning, in our anſwere to that Propoſition. Thirdlie, that his anſwere to our Seconde Exception before alleadged, is of no force, howſoeuer heere and euery where he referre vs to it. For which alſo we referre the Reader, to that which is ſaide in that place, in defence of the Exception aforeſaid, As alſo for the allegation of 2 Cor. 6. 14. vnto that which is ſaid concerning it in defence of our Firſt Reaſon before alleadged.

H. IACOB his 2. Reply to the 4. Reaſon.

1. IN this your defence of your 4. Reaſon, you renewe your Sophiſtrie, And that which is worſe, you wil not be tolde of it. Is it becauſe of the goodnes of your Reaſon that I denie no Propoſition? Nay, it is for the badnes of it: becauſe all is nought, all deceiptfull and ſophiſticall. Therefore I muſt diſtinguiſh euen ſo ſtill as I did before, and my diſtinction is good, cleerelie diſcouering all your fraude. What ſay you againſt it: Firſt (you ſay) *Are not their outward callings and ceremonies falſe, Antichriſtian and accurſed, aſwell as the reſt of their Worſhip & ſeruice?* Aſwell? Forſooth, I trow not, (that is, not as much). Their inwarde impietie and falſe faith againſt Chriſt, the onely all-ſufficient Sauiour, is farre more accurſed, and diueliſh then their bare outward orders, ſeparated from the reſt of their faith. But whoſoeuer ioyneth *ſimply*, and indifferently, either to *Turkiſh*, or *Popiſh* Aſſemblies, doeth ioyne with their whole, and worſt abominations, which haue no communion or coherence with Chriſt in deede, Neither can we alſo, if we ioyne therein. The caſe is not like, when we reteyne and vſe, ſome of their outwarde orders in our Aſſemblies.

2. And here you note that I graunt, *Some thinge may be ioyned vnto our Chriſtian faith in England, which would vtterly deſtroy it.* Moſt true, And here I note your moſt vnchriſtian and falſe dealing with me, in affirming otherwiſe of me, As I haue expreſſed in the beginning, about the taking of my Firſt maine Propoſition there. Which ſee further in pag. 4.

Laſtlie, my reference to the anſwere of your Firſt Reaſon, is a fit and full Refutation of you here, Neither is your Defence any thing againſt it, as there appeareth. Alſo this your Reaſon includeth Maiſter Cranmer, Ridley, &c. to be no true Chriſtians neither, as hath bene often alleadged.

Maiſter

Maiſter IOHNSONS V. Reaſon againſt the former Aſſumption: with Maiſter *IACOBS* Replies to the ſame.

REASON V.

AS the golden veſſels taken out of the Lords houſe, and had & vſed in Babilon of the Caldeans, did not therefore make the Babilonians true Iewes touching the faith: Nor their banquets wherin they vſed them, to be anie of the Lords Feaſtes (ſpoken of Leuit. 23.) but they ſtill remayned Babiloniſh people and banquets notwithſtanding:

So the truthes of the Goſpell (veſſels as it were of the Lords houſe) holden and receyued in the ſpirituall Babilon (whereof that other was a type) doe not make the people ſo ſtanding, to be true Chriſtians, Neither their Miniſtery and conſtitution to be Chriſtes appointed in his Teſtament: But they ſtill remaine the people, Miniſtery, and conſtitution, of Babilon notwithſtanding. See the proofes hereof in Dan. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. compared with Prou. 9. 17, 18. and Reuel. 17. 4, 5. and 18. 4. with 14. 8, 9, 10. 11.

H. IACOB his 1. Replie to the 5. Reaſon.

Your Reaſon is this.

THe materiall veſſells of Ieruſalem, were of the like power and vertue, to ſanctifie the Heathen Babilonians, As the holy chriſtian doctrines in that Booke, are to ſanctifie vs, that holde togeather with them ſome Popiſh ceremonies and orders as indifferent things:

But thoſe veſſells were not ſufficient to ſanctifie thoſe Babilonians, *Ergo*, Neither theſe truthes of the Goſpell can ſanctifie vs.

An abſurd compariſon: The Propoſition is moſt falſe, and ſo the ſcriptures quoted (Dan. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. compared with Pro. 9. 17, 18. Rom. 17. 4, 5. and 18. 4. with 14. 8, 9, 10, 11.) are as idely and vainely applied. See the Anſwere to the allegations in the Firſt Reaſon before.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 5. Reaſon.

THis he ſayth, is an abſurd compariſon. *So belike (if his graue iudgment might goe for good payment) the manifold alluſions which (in deſcribing the ſpirituall Babilon, the Spirit of God "maketh to the materiall Babilō of the Caldeans) were to bee accompted abſurd alluſions and compariſons. As alſo the often alluding, and likening togeather, the*

" Rev. 17. 18. and 15. compared w Iere. 50. 51. Cap. Iſay. 13. & 14. and 21. & 47.

* Isa. 66. 20. 21 Zach. 14. 20. 21. 1 Cor. 5. 7. 8. and 10. 2, 3, 4. Col. 2. 1. 12 He. 13. 15, 16. 1. Pet. 3. 20. 21 Reu. 15. 3. and 21. 20, &c.

" 2. Tim. 3. 8. 9. 1. Cor. 10. 6, &c. Heb. 12 16. 17. Iude. verſ. 11. Reu. 2. 14. 20. and 20. 8, 9.

* *holy things of the Lawe, with the holy thinges of the Goſpell, and the* " *tranſgreſſions then with the tranſgreſſions now, which are ſo often vſed in the Scripture: Are in his account abſurd alluſions and ſimilitudes. Secondlie,* he ſayth the Propoſition is moſt falſe. *Which we anſwer is moſt true and moſt plainely taught and declared in the fift of Daniels prophesie, verſ. 1, 2, 3, 4. and Leuit. 23. as we alleadged before, when we firſt pounded the reaſon, Wherevnto we yet haue receyued no aunſwere. So ſoundly he defendeth his cauſe.*

Thirdly he ſaith, The ſcriptures quoted *(Dan. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4.* compared with *Pro. 9. 17, 18. Reuel. 17. 4, 5, & 18, 4. and 14, 8, 9, 10, 11.)* are idely and vainely applyed. *But howe ſhewes he this to be ſo as he ſaith? Verie profondlie, I warrant you. For* he bids vs ſee the anſwere to the allegations in the Firſt Reaſon: *And this is all the proofe he bringes. Well: wee haue ſeene his anſwere to the allegations there, and finde: Firſt, that thoſe ſcriptures here alleadged, are not ſo much as once mencioned there. Secondlie that his anſwere to the allegations there ſet downe, is moſt friuolous and of no weight, but againſt him ſelfe, as there we haue declared.*

Laſtlie, in his propounding of our Reaſon otherwiſe then we had done (which in deede is a thing verie ordinarie, though nothing commendable in them) it ſeemeth, that being not able to anſwer anie parte of our Reaſon, as we had ſet it downe, yet he thought to helpe him ſelf by this exception, that the Materiall veſſells of Ieruſalem were not of the like power and vertue to ſanctifie the Heathen Babilonians, as the true doctrines receyued among the ſpirituall Babilonians, are to ſanctifie them. *But hee ſhall finde, if he will conſider and compare togeather the Scriptures heere alleadged, that the golden veſſells being holy to the Lorde, and taken out of his Temple, did aſmuch ſanctifie the Caldean Babilonians and their Feaſtes: As the holy doctrines (veſſels as it were of the Lordes Temple) had among the ſpirituall Babilonians, doe ſanctifie them and their conſtitution, That is, neither of their Eſtates and Aſſemblies are ſanctified thereby at all. For ſaith not the Lorde,* " *That the ſetting of mens poſtes and threſholds, (howe much more of Babilons enormities) by his Poſtes & Threſholdes, that is by his truthes aud ordinances, is ſo farre from ſanctifying, as it defileth his holy Name, yea is abomination in his ſight, and ſetteth a wall betweene him and them that doe it? Saith not the ſcripture alſo,* † *that the true doctrines in the falſe church are amonge them as ſtollen waters and hid bread, which though they be ſweete & pleaſaunt, yet there alſo is the mouth filled with grauell, and the gueſtes of thoſe feaſtes and aſſemblies, are ſo farre frō being ſanctified by thoſe truthes in that eſtate, as they are before God euen dead men, and in the deapth of hell.*

" Eze. 43. 8.

† Prou. 9. 17, 18. & 20. 17.

To

To conclude this point, hath not an Angell from heauen proclaimed it with a loude voice, that " *the ſpirituall Babilon, (notwithſtanding any truthes ſhe holdeth yet) is ſo vnſanctifyed and abominable, as ſhee is become a cage of all vncleane and hatefull birdes, and that all her children and Marchants that will not departe out of her, ſhall receyue of her plagues and damnation, and drinke of the wine of Gods wrath, yea of the pure wyne, which is powred into the cup of his wrath, and be tormented in fire and brimſtone, before the holy Angells and before the Lamb for euermore. Loe here their fearfull eſtate, which this man will needes accompt holy and acceptable before God.*

" Reu. 18, 1, 2, 3, 3, 11. &c. and 17, 1, 2, 3 4, 5. and, 14. 8, 9, 10, 11.

H. IACOB his 2. Reply to the 5. Reaſon.

IN this your defence of your Fifth Reaſon, *you miſlike that I call it an abſurd compariſon:* Where you affirme that *the golden veſſes of the Iewes were as available to ſanctifie the Babilonians, as the truthes of the Goſpell which wee hold are to ſanctifie vs.* In deed your owne wordes be, *holden and receiued in the ſpirituall Babilon.* By which termes you meane vs of England I trow. But marke ſir. Is not this groſſe ſophiſtery againe? Is not this childiſh vanitie, open beggerie, and crauing of that which is the whole queſtion? that is, *That our Churches are ſpirituall Babilon,* and as deepely infected in Babiloniſh impietie as thoſe old Caldeans. If they were ſo infected, I graunt in deed your Reaſon would follow: But ſeeing it is the queſtion, And ſeeing we profeſſe our ſelues true Chriſtians by thoſe truthes of the Goſpell which we hold (and as by Gods grace we are indeed) Say I not well, that this is an abſurd Compariſon? Yes Maiſter *Iohnſon*, it is a moſt *impious, abſurd, & ſenceleſſe compariſon, & void of common reaſon: And it inwrappeth Maiſter *Cranmer*, Maiſter *Ridley*, &c. within the ſame Iniurions, Yea irreligious conſequence likewiſe.

* To match thoſe outward veſſells, (of no ſanctity of them ſelues) with our inward doctrine of ſaluation.

All that you haue of alluſions, and alluding, betwene the Tipicall and ſpirituall Babilon, are meere deluſions, and vaine cauils. Proue vs firſt to be ſpirituall Babilon: Or els you fight with your ſhadow.

So that ſtill I ſay, thoſe Scriptures quoted of Dan. 5. &c. As alſo all the reſt here packed togeather in your Margen, they are miſerably and deſperately abuſed, according as I rightly referred you to my cenſure to your Firſt Reaſon: which for all your wordes, you haue not refuted. The very ſame I ſay of your other Two ſcriptures towards the end, Pro. 9. 17. &c. Reu. 18. 1. &c. As for Ezek. 43. 8. I anſwered it before † in your Firſt Reaſon.

† Pag. 34.

Fr. Iohn-

Maister IOHNSONS VI. Reason against the former Assumption: with Maister *IACOBS* Replies to the same.

REASON VI.

THe Samaritans (those counterfett children of Abraham, Isaack and Iacob) did publiquelie professe that most excellent doctrine of the Messias to come: (the trueth of which doctrine howe powerful it was to saluation, the Scriptures testifie): yet doeth our Sauiour Christ repute them false worshippers of God, because their worship was a mixt worship, framed after the inventions of men, and traditions of their Forefathers: Therefore sayth Christ vnto them: Yee worship that which ye knowe not, we worship that which we knowe, for saluation is of the Iewes. *By which wordes of Christ it plainely appeareth, that (although at that time, some professed such truthes which otherwise were anaylable vnto saluatio) yet none that were false worshippers of God, could truely challendge vnto them selues in such estate, the benefite of those truthes, but they onely which were the true Church and people of God, to whom the Oracles of God were committed, and to whom the Couenantes and seruice of God did appertayne, such as were at that tyme, (not the Samaritans) but the Iewes, and they which helde the faith of the Iewes: wherevppon (not the Samaritanes) but the Iewes, were then by Christ accounted the true worshippers of GOD, and heires of saluation, Iohn 4.22. compared with verse 20.25, 29. and with 2. King. 17, 24.*

In the like manner, the people of these Ecclesiasticall assemblies, standing subiect to a counterfett Ministerie and worship of God, (being also commingled togeather of all sortes of people:) Though they professe some truthes which otherwise are anailable to saluation, yet can not in such estate by the word of God, be deemed true Christians or true Churches: Neither can, so standing, challendge vnto them selues the benefit of those true doctrines which they professe, because God hath not made his promise vnto anie false Church or worshippers of him: neither committed vnto anie such his holy things, to witt, his word, prayer, Sacramentes, Censures, &c. But he hath made his promise, & committed these things only to his true Church and people, which worship him aright, and yeeld obedidience to his Gospell, keeping whatsoeuer he hath commaunded them: Wherevpon it followeth, that such people onely are true Christians, and

true

true churches of Christ, to whom the promises & holy things apperteyne, and not to the people and Ecclesiasticall assemblies of England, neither anie such, abiding in false worship or false constitution of a church, as is aforesaide.

H. IOCOB his 1. Reply to the 6. Reason.

THis your 6. Reason is, *The Samaritans* (beleeuing that Messias should come, Iohn. 4.25.) *were as neare saluation as We of England are. But they were false worshippers for all that. Ergo, so are We, for all our holy doctrines beleeued according to that Booke of Articles.*

I deny the Proposition. The Samaritans, might knowe by hearsay and beleeue, the Messias should come, and Balaam did know it, Nom. 24.17. and the Deuils doe now know and beleue, Iam. 2.17. Yet none of these beleeued [in] him. It followeth not therefore, that they were as nigh saluation as wee of England. In a worde, there is a Reason manifest. These Samaritans ioyned Heathenish Idols with the God of Israel. 2. Ki. 17. which wholy destroyed the trueth in them, though they did reteyne some memoriall amongst them of Messias to come. Wherfore here take the Second Answer to the First Reason before. But I will help them with an Obiection, surely one fitter then all these. * Pag. 23.

Obiection. The Israelites vnder Ieroboam at Dan and Bethell serued not Pagan Idols, but the true God after their own deuises, which yet resembled the ordinances of Ierusalem 2. King. 12.32. Amos. 4.4. Howbeit they were false worshippers, only for their false Ministery and outward false worship, for all that they beleeued in the God of Ierusalem otherwise tightly.

Ergo, so are wee of England only for our false Ministerie and outward worship.

Answere. To this wee answere also, what additions of deuices, and how grosse Idolatrie they held, it appeareth not: But surely it seemeth farre grosser, and filthier then the worst is with vs: But yet this appeareth cleerelie, that the conscience of euery of them, euen of the simplest, must needes be conuicted, that Ierusalem was the only place, and Arons line the only Priests (‡ & Leuits,) Therfore they could not be indeed true worshippers, nor within the couenant, nor neere to saluation, when they all openly rebelled, and forsooke them desperatly, whom the Lord had so expresly chosen. Now our assemblies throughout England haue not their consciences so conuicted in the Hyerarchie and Ceremonies. *Ergo*, wee may be in the couenant, which they were not, for all our corruptions.

‡ My meaning was the Leuits were not of Arons line, but § Priests only.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 6. Reason.

THis our 6. Reason, he neither propounded as we did, nor answereth directlie, and soundlie vnto anie part of it. But that the nakednes of

his answere, and light of the trueth may better appeare, we will propounde the Reason more shortlie in a Sillogisme, thus.

The people and assemblies, whose Ecclesiasticall constitution is such as to them in that estate the Couenantes, holy things, and service of God doe not apperteyne, they can not in such constitution by the worde of God be deemed true Christians or true Churches, whatsoeuer truthes they professe besides.

But such is the Ecclesiasticall constitution of the people and assemblies of Englande, as vnto them in that estate the Couenauntes, holy things, & service of God doe not apperteyne.

Therefore the people and Assemblies of England, can not in that constitution, by the word of God, be deemed true Christians, or true Churches, whatsoeuer truthes they professe besides.

The Proposition none will denie,

The Assumption is proued thus.

The people and Assemblies whose Ecclesiasticall constitution is such, as they worship God after a false manner, neuer appointed by him self, nor approued in his word: their constitution is such, as vnto them in that estate, the couenaunts, holy things, and service of God doe not apperteyne.

But such is the Ecclesiasticall constitution of the people and Assemblies of England, as they worship God after a false manner, neuer appointed by him selfe, nor approued in his word.

Therefore the Ecclesiasticall constitution of the people and Assemblies of Englande, is such as vnto them in that estate, the Couenaunts, holie things, and service of God, doe not apperteyne.

The Proposition was proued by the example of the Samaritans, and Christes speach and sentence of them in such estate, Ioh. 4. and 2 King. 17 Whervnto he answereth nothing to anie purpose, saue that, what he saith, is against him selfe. For where he graunteth That the Samaritans, and Balaam knewe and beleeued the Messias should come, yea and that the Deuills knowe and beleeue there is a God, and that Iesus is the Christ, the holy one of God. *Who seeth not, that most excellent truthes may be acknowledged, and yet they which so professe, be not therefore in their estate true Christians or true Churches, to whom the Couenauntes, holie things and service of God apperteyne. Where next he saith,* The Samaritans beleeued not in the Messias, *it will be heard for him to proone it, seeing he taketh beleefe in Christ so, as it is had in the spirituall Babylon and her daughters, and seeing also the Samaritans professed and beleeued, not onely that the Messiah should come, but euen he which is called Christ, & that when he came, he would declare vnto them all things. In so much as*

when

When Jesus was come, & had spoken but to a woman of Samaria, the scripture witnesseth, that manie of the Samaritans of that citie beleeued in him for the saying of the woman, which testified, he hath tolde me all thinges that euer I did, Ioan 4.25,26,29,30,39. Thirdly, where he saith, The Samaritans ioyned Heathenish Idolls with the God of Israell, which wholy destroyed the trueth in them which they held. By this againe it is euident, euen in his owne confession, Both that such things may be ioyned with the doctrines of trueth, as in that estate, they which professe those truthes, can not be iudged true Christians, or true churches, to whom the promises and holy things of God doe belong: And that therefore also, the * Proposition of his principall and maine Argument first propounded, is not generall, but of necessitie admitteth limitations: So as then his maine defence falleth to the ground, as alreadie we haue noted both in the beginning of this writing, in the answere to that Proposition afore saide: and againe in the defence of our Fourth Reason a little before. Moreouer, in that he sayeth, the Samaritans ioyned Heathenish Idols with the God of Israell. (2.King.17.) If he meane, that they worshipped the Idols them selues, sacrificing to them, and accompting them to be Gods as well as the God of Israell, and so brake the First commaundement, as before he affirmed in his answere to our First Reason: then we take it, that here againe hee is deceyued, as there we haue shewed. The scripture saieth, they worshipped & sacrifized to the Lord God of Israell. So as their sinne was against the Second commaundement, in that worshipping the true God, they did it in, and by those Images, as also by other deuices of their owne, and traditions of their predecessours. That this was their estate and sinne, besides that it appeareth in that chapter alleadged, it is also most plainlie sett downe, first by them selues, in that booke of Ezra, where they speake vnto the Iewes of the captiuitie that builded the Temple, saying:

We will buylde with you, for wee seeke the Lord your God as ye doe, and we haue sacrificed vnto him since the tyme of Esar Haddon King of Asshur, which brought vs vp hither. Then also betweene Christ and the woman of Samaria, Joh.4. where it is manifest, that the " contention betweene the Iewes and the Samaritans, was not whether onely the true God was to be worshipped, but both of them agreeing in that, whether the solemne place of his worship was in Ierusalem, or in the mount of Samaria, &c. Lastlie, by this mans owne confession, when he sayth in this place, that the Israelites vnder Ieroboam at Dan and Bethel, serued not Pagan Idolls, but the true God after their owne deuices. For the scripture testifieth, " that the Samaritans worshipped the same God, and after the same maner that the Nations did which were caried from thence. Nowe the nations that were carryed from thence, were the tenne Tribes that fel away from Iudah to Ieroboam: which likewise fea-

* See further for the answer of this in Pag. 4.

2. King. 17.

Pag. 30.

Ezra. 4. 1, 2.

" Ioh. 4. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30.

Pag 49.

" 2. King 17. 28, 32, 33.

red the Lord & serued their Images, that is, God in and by their Images as nowe also the Samaritans did that were come in their steede. Hetherto of his answere, which may seeme to concerne the Proposition of the latter Sillogisme.

The Assumption was shewed by this, that these assemblies being commingled togeather of all sortes of people, they haue also for the worship of God among them, a counterfett Ministerie and service, deuised by man: which he rightlie vnderstandeth, as we also doe, of their Hierarchie, and other abominations (before rehearsed) which deceiptfully heere againe he would smother vp vnder the name of ceremonies. Touching which slight of his, sufficient is said before in the handling of our First Reason. But what nowe saith he here, concerning the Assumption or proofe of it? Doeth he denie it? No. What then doeth he say for their counterfet Hierarchie, worship, &c. Surely nothing but this, That their Assemblies in England haue not their consciences conuicted in these, as the people vnder Ieroboam, could not but haue their consciences conuicted then, touching their worship and Priesthood. But first, if this were so: is this anie inst defence of their Ministerie, worship, or estate, that they yet see them not to be vnlawfull, as it could not be, but they vnder Ieroboam saw theirs to be? If this were a sufficient reason, might not the grossest Papist plead likewise for their Ministerie, worship, and estate, as also the Vsurers, extortioners, and persecutors, for them selues and their wickednes? By this reason, God should not haue sent Lyons among the Samaritans, because "yet, they knewe not the maner of worshipping the God of Israell, neither had their consciences conuicted therein. But Christ hath taught us otherwise, "that euen that seruaunt, which knoweth not his Maisters will, and yet committeth things worthy of stripes, shalbe beaten, though with fewer stripes, then he that knoweth and doeth it not. And euen of those Israelites aforesaide the Lord him selfe testifieth "that they were destroyed for lacke of knowledge. So then neither can this peoples ignorannce (which he pleadeth) be a sufficient defence for their estate. Or if it could, yet it seemeth they of Israell aforesaid, might aswell haue alleadged for them selues, seeing the Lorde witnesseth of them "that there was no knowledge of God in the lande. And thus the obiectiō also here brought by him selfe, remayneth still vnaunswered. Nowe where hee sayeth, that Aarons Line were the only Priests and Leuites, hee is also mistaken herein, In deede Aarons Line onely were the Priestes, but the Leuites were generallie of the Tribe of Leuie, though not of Aarons lyne. But to let this passe: We would knowe of him a sufficient reason, why the true worship and ministerie appointed by Christ in his Testament, should not be aswell knowne vnto them in these dayes, as in the defection of Israell?

He

1. King. 12. 27, 28, 29, 30, 31. & 2. King. 17. 32, 33, 40, 41.

2. King. 17. 26.

Luk. 12. 48.

Hos. 4. 6.

Hos. 4. 1.

He sayth They could not but knowe, that Ierusalem was the only place, and Aarons lyne the onely Priestes. *Haue not these the scripture asmuch as the other had? Or hath not Christ* * *the Sonne, bene as faithfull in the house of God, and as plainly set downe his will for his true worship and Ministerie in the time of the Gospell, as Moses the seruant was and did for the time of the Law? Yea and haue not* " *these by the word bene made manifest to the consciences of men in these dayes? And euen to the high Court of Parliament, representing the whole body of the land: as the other were to the Israelites in the time of their defection? Finally, doeth not this Land stand in as open rebellion against, and forsaking of the true Ministerie, worship, and order, appoincted by Christ to his church nowe, as the other did then, (if not more open and greeuous) not onely for the causes aforesaide, but because also they haue* " *receyued and still reteyne a false ministerie, worship, and confusion of the man of sinne, that sonne of perdition, and capitall enimie of the Lord Iesus Christ? And yet moreouer, least they should lacke anie thing of the other, and not euery way farre exceed them, doe also* * *persecute vnto bandes, exile, & death, such as beare witnes to the trueth of Christ, against their abominations aforesaide. By this then it appeareth, that the aduersarie heere, neither hath iustified their estate in respect of the Apostate Israelites, nor answered the obiection which him selfe framed against their present constitution: which therfore we will here set downe as he propounded it.*

* Heb. 3.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

" Witnes the publike Treatises, Sermons, Admonitions, Complaintes, Supplications, & Demonstrations, to the Parliamēt, besides ẏ bandes and sufferings of many in this behalf.

" Witnes the Pōtifical, Portuis, Canons & Constitution of the Popish, & their assemblies, cōpared togeather.

* Witnes their Actions, Statutes, &c.

The Obiection was this.

The Israelises vnder Ieroboam at Dan and Bethell serued not Pagan Idols, but the true God after their owne deuises, which yet resembled the ordinances at Ierusalem. 1. King. 12. 32. Amos 4. 4. How be it they were false worshippers, only for their false ministery, & outward false worship, for all that they beleeued in the God of Ierusalem rightly. Therefore so these of England, onely for their false Ministerie and outward worship.

This is his owne Obiection and Reason, vnto which hee hath giuen no sufficient aunswere, as before hath bene shewed. So that it still remayneth vpon himselfe as a testimonie against their present estate. This we neither did, nor needed to propound, as a seuerall Reason, amongst those which we set down, because it is of like nature with those wee mentioned amongest ours in the Second and Sixt Reasons before alleadged.

H. IACOB his 2. Reply to the 6. Reason.

IN this your defence of your 6. Reason you say, *That the Proposition of your last sillogisme, (They that worship God after a false manner, are are no true Christans) is proued by the example of the Samaritans, and* pag. 50.

that I answer nothing against it.

First I say, there you sophisticate againe. And it seemeth you can doe nothing else in argumentation. For your Proposition is Æquivocall and ambiguous. If you meane they that worship God after a false manner, that is totally, or els Fundamentally. Then I cleerely graunt it, and that the Samaritans doe proue the same, seeing they erred Fundamentally. But your Assumption touching vs, is then vtterly false. You bring not a sillable or one letter, to proue either of these Two against vs, in all your writing, neither can you, but bare begging of the controuersie which is infinite ofte. If you meane in your Proposition, They that serue God after a false maner, that is, in part, not Wholly nor Fundamentally, As namely in the Hyerarchy and externall ceremonies as Cranmer, &c. Then I say and avouch confidentlie in the presence of God, that such may be true Christians, though vnperfect in many things. Yea infinite, such haue bene, are, and may bee hereafrer, true Christians. The contrarie whereof, is no lesse then horrible blasphemie against God and his Saincts, wherfore your Proposition, is shewed to be againe sophisticall, as also those were in your Third Exception, and First and Second Reasons.

Secondly where you say, *the Samaritans proue it, and I say nothing against it.* Marke you. First I said, the Samaritans might knowe by hearsay, and yet not faithfully beleeue [in] the Messias. You cannot bee ignorant, that there is a great difference betweene an obscure rumor, which some of them might receiue from their neighbour Iewes, and yet not haue it constantly beleeued, and held publiquely among them, as their comon faith. If thus the *Samaritans* beleeued the comming of *Messiah*, they are in no cõparison with vs, we holde our most holy faith and doctrine by the worde professedly, as the publique ordinance of our Churchs sheweth. But furder let it be howsoeuer they held the comming of *Messiah*, yet I answered, The *Samaritans* ioyned Heathenish Idols with the God of Israell which wholly destroyed the trueth in them. And this is the very truth indeed, howsoeuer you will not yeld it. For you say, *that they broke not the First commaundement, they worshipped not the Idols themselues, nor sacrifised to thẽ, &c.* This is proued apparantly false in the Text 2. Kings. 17. 29, 30, 31. Enery nation made their Gods and put them in the houses of the high places which the Samaritans had made, euery nation in their Cities wherein they dwelt. For the men of Babel made Succoth-Benoth, and the men of Cuth made Nergall, and the men of Hamath made Asshima. And the Auims made Nibhaz and Tartak, and the Sephanims burnt their children in the fyer to Adramelch & Anammelech the Gods of Sepharuim: Therfore they worshipped the Idols of the Heathen, and sacrifised to them, and accoumpted them to be Gods aswell as the God of Israell. And so broke the First commandement, and therefore they touch not vs in this question, As the like I haue truely and well declared before, against your First Reason. Your proofes, *that the Samaritans brake not the First commandment* are nothing. (1) That of Ezra. 4. 1. 2. *that they sought the Lord as the Iewes did, &c,* was their conterfet hypocrisie and false brag, yea their diueliish conspiracie against the worship of the Iewes God. Doe

2. King. 17.

a pag. 34.
b pag. 51.

you

you beleeue their wordes here in this place, that they are true indeed? I graunt as I noted before out of 2. Kings 17. they had a mixed worship, some thing of the Iewes God, but very much and (as by that Chapter seemeth) most of the Heathens Gods. 2. Secondly, where you say out of Iohn. 4. *That it is manifest, there was no contention betweene the Iewes and the Samaritans, whether* * *only the true God was to be worshipped.* There appeareth no word of any such thing, Our Sauiour indeed noteth vers. 21. One difference betwene them, that was, but about the place of worshipping on occasion of the womans wordes: But that there was no difference betwene them in the obseruing of the First Commandement, he saith not. The contrarie you saw before proued in 2. King. 17. 30. 31. Pag. 51.

* A bolde assertion.

3. Thirdly you vrge my cōfession, *That the Israelites vnder Ieroboam serued not Pagan Idols but the true God after their owne deuices. And you would proue it too, by* 2. *King.* 17. 28, 32, 33. *Seeing the Samaritans worshipped after the manner of the nations that dwelt there before they came, who were the Tenne tribes that Ieroboam drew away.* I aunswere, First it is great shame, that you make this my confession, when I expresly bring it in, as your Obiection, whervnto I set mine answer, that the Idolatry vnder *Ieroboam* seemeth farre grosser and filthier then the worst is with vs, which I make manifest by the scripture, not only 1. King. 12. 28. where *Ieroboam* erected visible Idols, and very filthy ones, euen calues and brute beastes: which if they were but to worship God by, yet who would compare our Ecclesiasticall orders to them, which * we professe are but indifferent thinges, for order and comelinesse only. Further I alleadged 2. Chro. 11. 15. Where *Ieroboam* is said to appoinct Priestes, for the high places, for *Deuils*, and for the Calues that he had made. So I confesse little to your aduantage. Secondly, if the *Samaritans* worshipped (as they did indeed) like the Tenne tribes before them, then you are cleane gone. For though *Ieroboā* at the First had not ioyned in ꝧ Heathenish Idolatry. Yet *Ahab* did 1. King. 16. 32, 33. and his Sonne *Ahaziah* had further *Baalzebub* the God of *Ekron*. Yea the Israelites, as they of *Ierusalem* afterwardes, were Idolaters much a like 2. King. 17. 19. But wee read of the Iewes vnder *Ahaz* 2 Chr. 28. 23. and *Manasses* and *Amon*. 2 King. 21. and 23. 4, 5, 10, 11. 12, 13. That they vsed the very Pagans Idolatrie. Yea it is expressed, 2. King. 17. 8, 11, 16, 17. That these Tenne Tribes vsed the very same. Therefore the Samaritans doing as these Israelites did, held such grosse idolatry as could by no meanes stand with the true seruing of God. Finally as before is noted 2. King. 17. 29, 30, 31. doeth expresse this grosse Heathenish idolatrie of the Samaritans. Surely it appeareth more grosse and worse then the Israelites before them. And therefore you are greatly deceiued both here & in the defence of your First Reason before: where you expreslie mainteine *these Samaritans to holde no Heathenish Idolatrie, but onely to cleaue to the God of Israell in an outwarde deuised corrupt worship.* They acknowledged him, I graunt, but him only I denie, as hath ben proued.

Pag. 49.

* Viz. the generall state.

Pag. 50.

Pag. 39.

Further

Pag. 30. Further you affirme in your defence of your First Reason, *That they profeſſed the written lawe to be the rule, both for their inward beliefe, and outward manner of worſhip.* Where you would proue it *For that the Apoſtate Iſraelites did ſo of whom Ezeck. ſpeaketh.* First this followeth not, becauſe the Heatheniſh Samaritans were further from ſinceritie, then the naturall Iſraelites commonly. Secondly, Iſraell it ſelfe in this wretched Apoſtaſie, helde not the written law for their rule, ſeeing profeſſedlie they left this rule, and did conſtantlie worſhip Calues, and ſacrifized at Dan and Bethel. Thirdly, Ezekiell ſheweth, euen there, cap. 43. 7, 8. they kept not this rule, but departed therefrom, and that as appeareth profeſſedly, and conſtantly. Which moſt of all is ſeene in Ahab, Ahaziah, Ahas, Manaſſes, and Amon, as is before noted. Wherfore in theſe your ſayings Maiſter *Iohnſon*, you are intollerably too blame and foully deceaued. As for example, They profeſſed that which they did in 2. Kinges. 17. 29, 30, 31. was that after the rule of the written Lawe?

Ezek. 43. 8.

Pag. 34. 55.

Next you oppugne me, for that I alleadged our Aſſemblies throughout England, haue not their conſciences conuicted in the Hyerarchy and ceremonies, you ſay "*if this were ſo, is it any iuſt defence of your miniſtery, worſhip, eſtate, &c.* I tell you it is a iuſt defence for our miniſterie worſhip, and eſtate to be as touching the *ſubſtance* and *foundation* of Chriſtianitie, ſound and acceptable to God. Refute it if you can. I knowe it is no iuſt defence of our whole Miniſtery, eſtate, & manner of worſhip, which I neuer intended, much leſſe profeſſed to iuſtifie.

Pag. 52.

Where you would ſnatch at an advauntage about Aarons line, my meaning was, that they of Aaron were only for Prieſts, & their bretheren of Leui, only for Leuites.

But you paſſe this, and you ſet your ſelf in earneſt, *to proue vs all conuicted in conſcience aboute our Hyerarchie and ceremonies.* So that here you auouch openly, that third generall poinct which I obſerued in my very beginning aboue, for the which you haue this Reaſon. *Haue not wee the ſcriptures as much as the Apoſtate Iſralites had? Or did not Chriſt as fully and plainly ſett downe our miniſterie and worſhip in the Goſpell, as Moſes in the Law?* I aunſwere, this is true, as touching the word it ſelfe. In the Goſpell we are taught as plainly and as fully for the word it ſelfe, as the Iewes were in Moſes: But it is not yet ſo playne for our vnderſtanding and vſe. Why? Becauſe wee haue had a diſcontinuance of the "ſimple offices of Paſtours, Teachers and Elders for the ſpace of a Thouſand Three hundreth, or a Thouſand Four hundreth Yeares, and a continuance of the Prelacie all this while hetherto. Alſo, for that many auncient, and late learned, and Godly Chriſtians, haue beleued it, at leaſt cõuenient, if not neceſſary in the Church. And they haue expounded the Scriptures ſo, that they carry no ſmall ambiguity in this matter, in infinite Thouſands iudgement. Thus it hath pleaſed God in his prouidence, to ſuffer this miſtaking amongeſt Chriſtians, thus longe, and thus vniuerſally. Whereby it commeth to paſſe, that infinite Thouſand

pag. 3.

" The Paſtors of y Churchrs ſince, haue had many corruptions mixed in their callings, they haue not bene pure and ſimple euer ſince: or at leaſt wee cannot proue it otherwiſe, by any recordes now extant.

ſand conſciences are not eaſely conuicted, though they bee miſtaken in this caſe. With the Iewes it was not ſo in this matter that we talke of. As Moſes and the Prophets were moſt plain, that Ieruſalem muſt be the onlie place of ſolemne worſhip, Arons line the onely Prieſts, no Calues, nor any viſible kinde of Image or meanes to worſhip God in: So alſo they conſtantly and perpetually practized that courſe, euen from Moſes till the Apoſtacie of Ieroboam. When any ſqared from this courſe, theſe were not onely rebuked expreſlie by Gods voyce in his Prophets, from time to time: but alſo the obſtinate, were moſt fearfully ſmitten with Gods miraculous hand from heauen. So that for any to offend in theſe poinctes as Ieroboam did, It could not poſſible bee but in preſumptuous rebellion, with a high hand againſt God, and with a conuicted & ſeared conſcience. Which I ſay cannot with any ſhew of ſence, be ſaid of many Thouſand Chriſtians in this caſe touching the Prælacie, &c.

Further you vrge " theſe Reaſons *That this cauſe hath bene made manifeſt to the conſciences of men, yea to the Parliament of late times.* You ſay well to the conſciences of men: but not to the conſciences of all men, or the moſt men throughout the land. Yea or to the moſt of them that know and feare God, according to the religion now mainteyned, This is the very queſtion. If you meane ſo, that all mens conſciences are conuicted in this matter, All men ſurely will either pitty your ſimplicitie, or laugh at your folly. I pray you Maiſter *Iohnſon*, conſider your ſelfe, you were a true Chriſtian, longe before you fell into this ſeparation. Yea moreouer you were learned, yea you knew and acknowledged theſe very corruptions a great while, and yet condemned vs not, Nay you condemned the ſeparation earneſtly. I pray you is it not poſſible that numbers, who ſee not ſo farre as you did then, ſhould ſtill condemne your ſeparation, and yet be true Chriſtians, as you acknowledge that your ſelfe then was? *meipſe teſte.* Pag. 53.

That which you ad " of *perſecuting vnto bandes, exile and death* to proue our vtter aboliſhing from Chriſt generally: It is a toy. Firſt if you were meerely innocent, yet this could not make vs worſe then the Iewes in Chriſtes time: who for all that they perſecuted, yet were they not wholly falne from God. Secondly you ſuffer indeed more thē you need, if that you would but acknowledge the grace of God with vs ſo farre as it is. It is therefore not Chriſtes Croſſe in that regard, but your owne that you beare. Pag. ibid.

Finally let it bee noted, if here in this your 6. Reaſon you bee not directly contrary to your ſelf, as I haue obſerued in your 2. Reaſon: Pag. 39. For you ſay here, Pag. 48. *That not the Samaritans, but the Iewes, were then by Chriſt counted the true worſhippers of God, & heires of ſaluation,* Ioh. 4. 22. But in your Second Reaſon, Pag. 35. you ſay: *They that teach for doctrine mens precepts, as there Chriſt ſaith the Iewes then did, thoſe in particuler are no true Chriſtians, nor their aſſemblies true Churches.* Therfore you inferre, (or elſe you pretend it) that thoſe perticuler Iewes Maiſter Iohnſon his contrarietie proued betweene his 2. Reaſon and his 6. Reaſon. Math. 15. 9.

were not then true worshippers, nor their assemblies true Churches which is a flat contradiction, Or else what is. But if you say you meane not this of the Iewes, then you abuse the scripture and vs, turning it cleane from them, whom in your Reason you speake of, and whom Christ therein expresly meaneth.

Maister IOHNSONS VII. Reason against the former Assumption: with Maister *IACOBS* Replies to the same.

REASON VII.

IF the Spirit of God accompt them to bee departers from the faith (and consequently no true Christians) which though they hold other truthes of the Gospell, yet forbid to marry, & commaund to abstaine from meates, which God hath created to bee receiued with thankesgiuing: Then what doeth the Lord accompt of them which forbid the true Ministerie and worship of God, and commaund a false: and of them also which partake therein? Which to be the estate of the Prelates, and other Ministers and people of these assemblies, appeareth, not only by their practize and persecution, but also by the booke of Articles heere alleadged, as may be seene in the 35. and 36. Articles, compared with their booke of Cannons, set forth, Anno 1571. and with the Articles lately set forth by the Prelate *of London, that now is, and inquired of in his visitation Anno 1595. As also by other their Articles, Cannons, Aduerticements, Iniunctions, &c. which were longe heere to rehearse.*

But the former is true, 1. Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3. Therefore, &c.

* Richard Fletcher.

H. IACOB his 1. Reply to the 7. Reason.

THis your Seauenth Reason is: *They are departed from the faith, that forbid to marry, & commaund to abstaine from lawfull meates. Also this is worse, then that: viz. to forbid the true Ministerie and to commaunde a false: which wee in England doe. Ergo wee are departers from the faith.*

* See Rhemi. Testa. in Mat. 15. 18.

I denie this Antecedent, that is your Assumption, with a distinction. The Papistes * forbidding of Mariage and of meates, if they had done no worse, doeth not make them departers from the faith: that is, *not* "*totally*. No more could their Hyerarchie and ceremonies *simply*: Neither doe these thinges make vs (the Protestants) to be such. The Papistes fall

" Or not fundamẽtally, not simply, which words I think fitter to bee here vsed, as in my next Reply is further declared.

from

from Christ " wholy in other poincts, (namely 1. The Papall supremacy. 3. The sacrifice of the Masse. 3. Iustification by workes: Which blessed bee God wee are farre from. Therfore the Apostle in saying, They departed from the faith, meaneth, in *these poincts they erred or departed from the faith, but not absolutlie & wholie. 2. Furthermore touching your Proposition, if you vnderstand Paul, of Martion the Hæretike, and Tatianus, who did absolutly condemne Marriage and certen meates, they euen therein might wholie fall from the faith, I meane somewhat like to Balaam, Iudas, and those Apostate Israelites lately spoken of, namely for hauing their cõsciences conuicted, and seared with a whot iron. And thus are they in no comparison with vs of England, nor with the Papistes neither, if they had erred in nothing else.

" That is fundamentally, & simply: see in the 2. Answer following.

* Viz. in abstayning from Mariage and meates.

Pag. 49. 57.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 7. Reason.

HEre the aduersarie being not able with any colour to denie the consequẽt, of our Reasõ neither to iustifie their present Ministerie, Worship Cannons, Articles, Iniunctions, &c. (which yet he must doe, & still we call for it, if he will iustifie their present estate): yet being desperate sure, for els he would neuer haue done it, he seareth not to gainesay the Assumption, that is, the very wordes and testimonie of the scripture it selfe, 1. Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3. The Apostle sayth, that they which forbidde Mariage & Meates, are departers from the faith, This man sayth no. Nowe, whether of these shall we beleeue? But what colour hath this man for his deniall? Forsooth this: That they which doe so, doe not departe from the faith *totally*, and that the Apostles meaning is, that in these poincts they departe from the faith, but not absolutely and wholy. *So by this mans conceite, none may be accounted departers from the faith, that depart only in some poinctes, but they which doe it totally from all. And thus then may no heretikes or Antichristes that euer haue bene, or shalbe in the worlde, be iudged departers frõ the faith, because they departe from it but in some poinctes, and not absolutely from all. Thus in one word hath he iustified at once the Arians, Nestorians, Sabellians, Papistes, Familistes, Anabaptistes, and whom not? because they departe but in some, not wholy from all poinctes of faith. Is it not great pitie that Antichrist hath so long wanted this stout Champion, that can thus in one worde, iustifie his forbidding of meates and mariage, yea and his most detestable Hyerarchie, and superstitions? Nowe by this mans learning, all the Martirs & Writers heretofore, that by euidence of this scripture cõuicted the Synagogues of Antichrist to haue departed from the faith, and therefore separated from them: were vtterly deceyued. Nay and the Apostles themselues were wholy mistaken, when speaking of Antichristes church and Religion, they call it a* " *misterie of iniquitie,* " *speaking lies through hypocrisie,*

* 2 Thes. 2. 7.
" 1. Tim. 4. 2.

"priuely bringing in damnable hereſies, and hauing a * ſhewe of godlines, but denying the power thereof. And Johns eyes alſo it ſeemeth were not matches, when he ſaith, † the ſawe in the whores forehead, (that is in Antichriſtes church and Religion) a name written, A myſterie, great Babylon, the mother of whoredomes, and abhominatoins of the earth. For we would knowe of this deepe Clerke, howe Antichriſtes church and religion ſhould iuſtlie be accounted a myſterie of iniquitie, and truely be ſaide, to ſpeake Lies in hypocriſie, alſo priuely to bring in Damnable hereſies, and to haue a Shew of godlines: if they did abſolutely & wholy departe from the faith, and not onely from ſome pointes thereof? But ouer and aboue all, it ſeemeth by this reaſon, that not onely the Apoſtles were miſtaken, in giuing vs ſure markes howe to knowe falſe teachers and falſe religions, 1 Tim. 1. 2, 3. 2 Pet. 2. 1. 2 Theſ. 2. 7. 2 Tim. 3. 4. Reuel. 17. 5. But alſo Chriſt him ſelfe, when he ſaide, "Beware of falſe Prophetes, which come to you in ſheepes clothing, but inwardlie are rauening Wolues. And againe * If any ſhall ſay vnto you, Loe, here is Chriſt, or there, beleue it not: For there ſhall ariſe falſe chriſtes and falſe prophets, and ſhall ſhew great ſignes and wonders, ſo that (if it were poſſible) they ſhould deceyue the very elect. Nowe if they ſhould totally departe from the faith, what ſheepes clothing, I pray you, ſhould they haue to come in? Or howe ſhould either them ſelues be ſaid to come in the name of Chriſt, affirming their Religion to be Chriſtes, and ſhewing ſignes and wonders to drawe men thereunto: Or the elect to be in ſuch vnſpeakeable daunger to be deceyued by them? This might ſuffice to ſhewe the falſehood and impietie of his anſwere: But we will note a fewe things moe therein. It being graunted him, that the popiſh forbidding of mariage and meates, if they were not worſe, doeth not make them departers from the faith totally: yet let him tell vs, if holding neuer ſo manie truthes beſides, "yet forbidding theſe, they could by the word of God truely be ſaide in that eſtate* to holde the faith of Chriſt, and to be true Chriſtians. If they could not (as the Apoſtle "teſtifieth) then is this anſwere in this reſpect alſo nothing to the purpoſe, but againſt him ſelfe, both for the popiſh forbidding of meates and marriages, and for the Engliſh Hyerarchie, and other abominations amongſt them receyued from the Papiſtes, which vnder colour of this anſwere heere he would defend. Againe, where he ſaith, That the Papiſtes fall frō Chriſt in other poinctes beſides the aforeſaid, Namely, 1 The Papall ſupremacie, 2. The ſacrifice of the Maſſe. 3. Iuſtification by workes: which Englande nowe is farre from. Let him tell vs: Firſt, whether in this ſence the Papiſtes can for theſe be ſaid to departe from the faith totally? If they can not, then what weight is there in this for defence of their eſtate, that the Papiſtes could not alſo alleadge for them ſelues, to witt, that in theſe

poinctes

" 2 Pet. 2. 1. * Tim. 3. 4.

† Reue. 17. 5.

& Mat. 7. 15.

* Mat. 2. 23. 24

" See in Bales Votaries, Acts and monumēts &c. what abominable filthines the forbidding of mariage, and what ſuperſtitiō the forbidding of meates, hath wrought in the kingdome of Antichriſt.

* What man fearing God durſt once opē his mouth for ſuch Diueliſh doctrines and eſtate.

poinctes they departe from the faith, but not absolutely and wholy. Secondly, let him tell vs, whether there are not other poinctes but these three in the papistes religion, which make them in their estate to be departers frō the faith, and consequentlie false christians and false Churches? If there be (as he can not denie it) then of what weight is his answer to defende the present constitution of these people and assemblies (for whom he pleadeth) seeing there are diuers other thinges besides these, that doe and may cause, that they may not be deemed true Christiās or true Churches in that estate.

Many [a] heretikes heretofore haue, and at this day doe reiect these three aforesaid, are they therfore in their estate to be accounted true christians or true Churches? So then, his manner of reasoning heere for their defence, is, as if the Adulterers, to iustifie their course of life, should alleadge thus: We are noe 1. Blaspemers, 2. no Persecutors, 3. No Murtherers, as such and such are: therefore we departe not from the way of life, but our estate and course of life is good, and such as may be continued in. But the scripture teacheth otherwise, saysinge: [b] Whosoeuer shall keepe the whole Lawe, and yet fayleth in one poincte, is guilrie of all. For he that sayed, Thou shalt not commit adulterie, saied also, Thou shalt not kill. Nowe, though thou doest no adultery, yet if thou killest, thou art a transgressour of the Lawe: and contrariwise. So that what soeuer sinnes the Adulterer be farre from, yet (as [c] Salomon saith) Hee that committeth adulterie with a woman, fayleth in heart, and destroyeth his owne soule. The same is the case of all spirituall Adulterers likewise: who (what soeuer sinnes they be farre from) yet in the worship of God, runne a [d] whoring after their owne inuentions, [e] embracing the bosomes of strange women, & [f] drinking of their cup of fornications. Thirdly, let him shewe vs sufficient warrant frō the scriptures, why (setting these three aside) the other popish Hyerarchie and abominations receyued amongst them, can not bee iudged to make them in such estate, departers from the faith, and therfore false Christians and false Churches, whatsoeuer truthes they should hold beside. If he cannot (as who seeth not, that it can not be donne?) then by this also it appeareth, that his answere here is of no force for defence of their estate, but against it, as we haue declared before.

[g] Corah, Dathan, Abyram, and their partakers, were farre from the Abominations of the Heathen, they holde also al the poinctes of faith, that Moses and Aaron held, differing onely from them, and departing only from the faith, in a matter concerning the Priesthood, whereof also they [h] shewed their reasons why they were so perswaded: yet will he not denie, we suppose, but that they departed from the faith, and were in this estate neither to be accounted true Israelits, nor their assemblies true Churches, with which communion might be kept. If he should, the scripture it selfe would witnesse against him herein, Numb. 16. 26. Nowe compare case

a Iemens, Sabellius, Arius, the Anabaptistes, &c.

b Iam. 2. 10. 11.

c Pro. 6. 32.

d Num. 15. 39

e Pro. 5. 20.

f Reuel. 17. 4.

g Num. 16. 12. &c.

h verse the. 3.

with case, and tyme with tyme, and the estate of these people and Assemblies of England, wilbee found farre more grieuous, as we haue already shewed both in the defence of our Second Exception before, and in[i] other Treatises to which yet we haue receiued no answer.

[i] In the answer to Master Hildersam, and in the 9. Reasons concerning not hearing the Ministers of these assemblies.

To conclude this poinct, if their Abominations in England were farre fewer then they are, yet so longe as they reteyne that poysonfull leauen of their Hyerarchie and worship, wee must tell them as the Scripture saith, and experience teacheth: That [ee] a litle poyson bringeth death vnto the whole pot of pottage. And [*] litle leauen leaueneth the whole lump. And a [ee] few dead flyes cause the oyntment of the Apothecarie to stinke and putrifie. Although indeed their abominations are not a few, but swarme in aboundance amongst them, some whereof wee haue rehearsed before in the defence of our First Reason, where the Reader may take a view of them.

[ee] 2. Kings. 4. 39. 40.
[*] 1. Cor. 5. 6.
[ee] Eccle. 10. 1.

Now in the next place, fearing belike that the euidence of the scripture we alleadged, could not by these shiftes of his be auoyded, but that still the reason deducted from thence stood strong against them, as we haue shewed it doeth: therefore he would haue vs now passe by them, and not apply this scripture to them, or their mother Church of Rome, but vnderstand it of Martion the heretike, and Tatianus, of whom he saith, that they absolutelie condemning mariage and certen meates, might indeed euen therin wholie fall from the faith, somewhat like to Baalam, Iudas, and those Apostate Israelites lately spoken of, namely for hauing their consciences conuicted and seared with an whote iron: And thus (saith he) are they in no comparison with them of England: *Well, But first if his former answer were of any weight, it might be asked, why then the followers of Martion and Tatianus, might not likewise haue defended them thus, & said, that their departure from the faith, was but in some poincts, not wholy from all? Secondly we answer, that if this scripture was verified as he graunteth) in Martion and Tatianus, for their condemning of mariage and meates, then we must needes also thinke it verified in the Romishe whoore, and her apostate children, whiche are falne into the verie sinnes, that are heere mentioned. The Apostle mentioneth Martion and Tatianus, no more then he doeth the whoorish Babilon, and the children of her Fornication: but comprehendeth heere all such who so euer they be, as shall fall into this Apostasie.*

Nota.

Nowe moreouer, if the [ee] wordes of this scripture be duely weighed, & either other scriptures, or the estate of the Romish Harlott and her children compared therewith, it wilbe founde as linely to describe these, as either Martion or any other that euer were in the world. First when the Apostle sayeth, that this shalbe in the latter tymes, who seeth not that it doeth

[ee] 1. Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3.

doeth most directly poinct at the Romish Whoore, though we doubt not, but Martion also and Tatianus, which liued twelue hundreth yeares since, or thereabouts, may also be comprehended therein. Secondly, when it is saide, they shall departe from the faith, thereby signifying that once they held the faith, howe plaine is this of the Romish harlot, which in the "Apostles time was the beloued spouse of God, and since is falne into Apostacy, and become the Mother of whoredomes and abominations of the earth, as the *scriptures in other places witnesseth. Thirdly, whē it is saide, they shall giue heede to spirits of errour, and doctrines of Deuils, how fitly agreeth this to the Romish Babilon which (as the scripture els "where testifieth) is become the habitation of Deuils, and the hold of all foule spirits? Fourthly when it is saide, they shall speake lies through hypocrisie (not to recken vp the infinite particulars that might be alleadged for proof hereof) how fitly doth this describe the Religion and practise of the man of sinne (the Romish Antichrist) which the scripture * els where calleth a mistery of iniquitie: as pretending to be with and for Christ, and to draw men vnto him, when indeed it is opposed against and exalted aboue the Lord Iesus Christ, and all his holy ordinances. Fifthly, when it is saide, they shall haue their consciences seared with an whote iron, how true is this found vpon the throane of the Beast, & his Kingdome, concerning which, the scripture also testifieth in "another place, that when the viales of Gods wrath shalbe powred out vpon them, and they conuinced of their impieties and abominations, they shalbe so farre from acknowledging and forsaking thē, as they shal gnaw their tōgues for sorrow, & rather thē they will forsake their wickednes, shall* fight against God and his truth, blaspheaming the God of heauen for their paines & for their sores, & not repenting of their workes. Lo here a seared conscience in the beastes kingdome. Finally, when the Spirit of God here giueth two particular instances of his apostacie. 1. The forbidding of Mariage, 2. And the cōmaunding to abstaine from meates, which God hath created to be receiued with thankesgiuing. How directly doeth he in both these, as it were with the finger, poinct at the Romish Babilon and her daughters? In the one, that is, the forbidding of mariage, when as the Romish Babilon forbiddeth it to Priests, Friers, Nunnes, and such like, and the English her daughter, to fellowes of Colleges, and prentises, and both of them, to all men and women in Lent, Aduent, Rogation weeke, &c. In the other, that is, the forbidding of meates created of God to bee receiued with thankesgiuing, when as both of them, commaund to abstaine from flesh, on their saincts eues, Emberdayes, Lent, Fridayes, and Satterdayes, throughout the yeare.

" Rom. 1. 7.

* 2. Thes. 2. 3. and Reu. 17. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

" Reu. 18. 2.

* 2. Thes. 2. 7.

" Reu. 16. 10. 11.

* Let their rayllinges, slaunders, edictes, articles, iniunctions, shalbe their continuall oppositions and madnes against ỹ truth and people of God, be witnesses of all this.

Nota.

Thus then we haue shewed that this scripture (which hee would turne

ouer

ouer to Martion and Tatianus) doth most fitly agree vnto, and most plainly describe the Romish Apostacy, whether wee apply it to their present estate, or compare this and other scriptures togeather, speaking of the same Apostacy and defection. By this also which hath bene said, it may appeare, that as he saith of Martion and Tatianus, that they might be said wholy to fall from the faith somewhat like to Balaam, Iudas, and those apostate Israelites lately spoken of, namely for hauing their consciences conuicted and seared with an whot iron: So also it is verified, and may be said of the Romish Babilon and her daughters. Touching which point of their conuicted consciences, as also of the Apostate Israelites in particuler, compared with them of Englande, see moreouer what is saide before in defence of the sixt Reason at the end thereof.

Now if seeing the euidence of this [cc] scripture, so full & plaine against them (as hath bene declared) he would except, that so it is in the Romish Church, but not in theirs of Englande: First by this meanes he would ouerthrowe his owne answere here, which hath denied it, of the popish forbidding of meates and marriages, and would turne it ouer from them to Martion and Tatianus: Secondly, this would not hinder but that the consequent of our Proposition and the Assumption also were good, and therefore the Argument strong and of force. Thirdly, the particulars before mentioned, (being founde in their Church of Englande) will testifie it also, to be verified of them. Lastlie, although many of the abominations of the whoores cup of Babilon be nowe cast out of England, (for which also we prayse God) yet so long as they reteyne the Hyerarchie, Stinted Leyturgie, confusion of people, Canons, Excommunications, &c. derined vnto them from that mother of whoredomes and abominations of the earth, wee must needes beleeue and alleadge against them the scripture and common prouerbe which sayth: As is the Mother, So is the Daughter. And hetherto of the defence of this reason.

Nowe moreouer lett it heere be obserued, howe these men, to defende their estate, are glad to runne into the Papistes Tentes, and to take vpp their worne & rustie weapons, which haue bene of no force to defend themselues, but haue bene often & iustly turned into their owne bowels. Read the [a] Reames Annotations vpon this place (1. Tim. 4.) and see if these men heere would not auoyde the euidence of this scripture against them, by the very same shift and answer, by which the detestable Iesuites there would turne it from their mother of Rome, that is, by posting it ouer from themselues to Martion and Tatianus. Read it, and note it well.

H. IACOB

cc 1 Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3.

Reue. 17. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Ezek. 16. 44.

a Rhemes notations vpon 1. Tim. 4. 3.

H. IACOB his 2. *Reply to the* 7. *Reason.*

TO this your defence of your Seuenth Reason, I say, Though euery where you are very vnreasonable, yet no where you seeme more vnconscionable and wilfull then here.

First, doe I say No to the Apostles Yea, 1. Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3. That they who forbid Mariage and Meates doe fall from the faith. Doe I say noe? Is this your conscience? Say I not expresly, They doe in these points departe from the faith, but not *absolutly* and *wholy*. A strange vntruth.

Secondly, doeth it follow by my words, as you affirme, *That none departe from the faith but those that departe totally, wholy, and absolutely, whereby all the vildest Heretikes should be iustified, as Arrians, Nestorians, Anabatists, &c.* Doe I say so? Is this also your conscience? Againe doe I say, *The text doth not reproue all the Papists in their forbidding of Mariage and Meates, but only Martion and Tatianus of old?* Doe I say any such thing? Nay, say I not expresse the contrarie? Are you then a man of conscience? Doe you suffer for conscience? Know therefore that this I say, and my wordes before doe import so much. That whosoeuer doe forbid mariage or meates, doe depart from the faith. But note: some doe more, some lesse. There are some that doe simply and fundamentally, and others in some sorte. Men departe from the faith Simply and Fundamentally two wayes. First they which doe erre in such maine poincts as doe vtterly abolish vs from Christ and destroy the Foūdation: thus doe Arrians, Manichees, Seruetus, Papistes, &c. Secondly, such as holding the Foundation in doctrine sound, doe desperatly professe and teach some what els, against the manifest light that is in them: so Martion and Tatianus, doe Fundamentally and simply fall from the faith, because they simply forbid those good ordinances of God, Marriage and Meates, euen against the light of conscience & nature: togeather wherewith, a liuely sauing faith cannot possibly stand. Now the Papists in this do departe from the faith also, but that is only in some sorte or in parte: because they forbid these things (not absolutly, but) vnto some, & sometimes. They that departe thus from the faith, may bee true Christians notwithstanding, yea they are certenly, if they be no worse in any thing els, albeit you deny it here most fondly & without all sence. To which end you most vnlearnedly and vngodly apply those scriptures, *A litle leauen leueneth the lump, A few dead flyes make the oyntment to stincke, and a little poyson bringeth death.* Will you haue no tainte of euell in a Christian, but it quencheth the life of God in vs needes? Is it not possible your selues might hold some such errors, and yet remayne true Christians notwithstanding? Then if Papists were no worse but in those errors only, they might be true Christians notwithstanding. But Martion and Tatianus doe wholy departe from the faith, not but that they beleued some truthes: but in that they "*presumptuously* quenched the instinct of nature & conscience, as I haue said. Here then it appeareth how wicked a sclaun-

Scriptures abused.

" The same did Corah, Dathan and Abyram likewise. See before in answer to §. 2. Exception, §. a Reply.

a ſclaunder it is that you ſay, *I runne into the Papiſtes tents, and fight with their weapons, & doe iump with the Remiſts annotations on*, 1. *Tim.* 4. 1, 2, 3. Iudge now by this that I haue ſaid, whether I doe or no.

And note, that I ſaye, that they be either Apoſtates or departers from the faith, not onely who fall *totally*, as you ſclaunder me that I ſaye: but alſo who fall *fundamentally*, that is, eyther the firſt way or ſecond, as I haue afore ſaide. And ſo doe theſe groſſe Heretikes whom you mention, 1 Arius, Seruetus, Papiſtes, &c. 2. Martion, Tatianus, Iudas, Corah, Balaam, the Apoſtate Iſraelites, &c. Thus then your queſtions and demaundes about the Papiſtes and their errors, I paſſe by, as more vayne, then pertinent. Onely note withall, if this reaſon of yours were good, it maketh Maiſter Cranmer, Ridley, &c. to be departers from the faith, & no true Chriſtians.

Maiſter IOHNSONS VIII. Reaſon againſt the former Aſſumption: with Maiſter *IACOBS* Replies to the ſame.

REASON VIII.

IF the Apoſtle accounpted them denyers of the faith and worſe then infidels (and conſequently no true Chriſtians) who (though they held other truthes of the Goſpell yet) prouide not for their houſehold: Then what will he accounpt of them, who (though they profeſſe ſome truthes of the Goſpell, yet) are not true worſhippers of God, but execute or ſubmit vnto a falſe miniſterie, worſhip, and gouernment eccleſiaſticall: Which to be th'eſtate of the Miniſterie and people of theſe aſſemblies, appeareth as afore ſaid.

But the firſt is true 1, *Tim.* 5. 8. *Therefore, &c.*

H. IACOB his 1. Reply to the 8. Reaſon.

THis your Eight Reaſon is thus much: viz. *Like as it is for a profeſſor, not to prouide for his houſhold. ſo is it to hold the Hierarchy, &c. But that is to deny the faith, and to bee worſe then an infidel. Ergo ſo are we in England.*

*I meane Fundamentally, as in the laſt Reaſon before I haue ſhewed.

Thoſe very anſwers to the laſt Reaſon, doe fully and flatly ſatisfie this alſo: Either againſt the Aſſumption, (namely that it is not meant ſimply of denying the faith, nor *wholy, but in this point only: Or els the propoſition,

poſitiō, as being meant of ſuch, as neglect their families againſt the light of their conſciences, and the manifeſt inſtinct of nature.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 8. Reaſon.

FOr anſwere of our ſaid Eight Reaſon, he referreth vs to thoſe anſwers of his, to the laſt Reaſon, which he ſaith doth fully and flatly ſatisfie this alſo, for the Propoſition and Aſſumption. But this which he ſaith, we haue in the defence of that Reaſon, declared to be altogeather vntrue: Therefore yet we haue receiued no anſwere, either to that Reaſon, or this. That thus it ſtandeth we referre the Reader for it vnto that which is ſaid in defence of that Reaſon aforeſaid: wiſhing the Reader moreouer to obſerue, both there and here in his anſwer to the Reaſon following, that the power of the truth ſo preuaileth againſt them, as they cannot but graunt, that they departe from and deny the faith, in their miniſterie, worſhip and gouernement eccleſiaſticall, as appeareth in their Canons, booke of Common prayer, Articles, Iniunctions, perſecutions, &c. All which beeing mentioned vnto them as proofes thereof, in theſe ſeuerall reaſons: when now they ſhould defend theſe particulers, if they would maintaine their ſtanding, behold they are as mute as a fiſh therein: and not that onely, but in their aunſwer to the next Reaſon following, graunt vnto vs, that in theſe things we may and ought to ſeparate from them. Which is directly to yeeld vs the cauſe: Thus ſoundly they anſwer vs, and diſpute for themſelues.

H. IACOB his 2. Reply to the 8. Reaſon.

TO this your Eight Reaſon and defence thereof, I aunſwer as before: If you take the Apoſtle to meane, ſuch neglecters of their houſhold as deny the faith, not Fundamentally nor againſt the inſtinct of nature, but only againſt conuenient Chriſtian prouidence, and no otherwiſe: Then I deny your Aſſumption. If the Apoſtle meane of ſuch, as neglect their families againſt the light of conſcience, & natures inſtinct, then I deny the Propoſition. This I ſay, becauſe the Apoſtle may very well meane both theſe, but in a diuerſe meaſure and proportion of ſinne: but then this concerneth not vs, Euen ſo as I haue ſaid to your former Reaſon. Note alſo, if this were a true Reaſon, it maketh Maiſter Cranmer, &c. denyers of the faith, and no true Chriſtians alſo. For maintenance where of, you haue here not one poore word at all.

Touching that you ſay we cannot deny, but graunt, that wee departe from and deny the faith in our Miniſterie. I haue told you how, in my anſwer to your 7. Reaſon, Alſo ſee my Replies to your 2. Exception.

Maiſter IOHNSONS IX. Reaſon againſt the former Aſſumption: with Maiſter *IACOBS* Replies to the ſame.

REASON IX.

THey which teach otherwiſe and conſent not to the wholſome wordes of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, and to the doctrine which is according to godlines, are by the rule of the Apoſtle to be ſeparated from, and therefore cannot in that caſe by the word of God be deemed true Chriſtians, 1. Tim: 6. 3. 4, 5.

But that ſo it is with the miniſters and people of theſe aſſembles, in regarde of their miniſterie, worſhip, and Church conſtitution, appeareth by the Seauentene poincts of falſe doctrine, &c. which are already ſet down, and by the prooſes before alleadged out of their own Cannons, Articles, Iniunctions, &c.

Therefore the Miniſters and people of theſe aſſemblies, in regard of their miniſterie, worſhip, and Church conſtitution, are by the rule of the Apoſtle to be ſeparated from, neither can in that caſe by the word of God be deemed true Chriſtians.

H. IACOB his 1. Reply to the 9. Reaſon.

THis your laſt Reaſon is. *Separat frõ thẽ that teach otherwiſe then the truth: 1 Tim. 6, 3, 4, 5. We holding thoſe Articles, doe teach diuerſe thinges in the Hyerarchie &c. that be otherwiſe then is truth. Therefore we muſt be ſeparated from, and conſequently we are no true Chriſtians.*

This is a falacy alſo Separate from ſuch, Ergo ſeparate wholy. See my 1. and 2. Reply afore to the third Exception, alſo the Anſwer to the two laſt Reaſons of all, the 7. and 8. We graunt therefore, ſo farr forth as we hold otherwiſe then trueth, ſo farr ſeparate from vs, but not any farther at all: not wholly, or abſolutly. And ſo the Apoſtle heere meaneth. Wherefore briefly: Becauſe you proue vs not wholy to deny the trueth, nor *fundamentally*, nor *obſtinately*, *peruerſly*, and *deſperatly* any parte thereof, like thoſe Iewes Act. 19. 8. whom Paul ſeparated from, which he did not from all other Iewes, Act. 13. 14. and 16. 3. and 21. 23, 24, 26. and 3. 1. Therefore you ought not wholy to ſeparate from vs, Neither to condemne vs wholy as aboliſhed from Chriſt, no more then Maiſter *Cranmer* and *Ridley* were with their Congregations in King Edwards time. And thus

thus our Assumption in the beginning, standeth firme, The doctrine in the booke of Articles, is sufficient to make a true Christian.

Conclusion.

The contrarie whereof, is such a Paradox, as hath not bene heard of till this day: All reformed Churches in Europe doe and haue alwayes held otherwise. Themselues * heretofore haue acknowledged and professed it. The holy Martirs that liued in King Edwardes dayes, and died in Queene Maries dayes, must bee otherwise cut of from Christ, who were true Christians by vertue of this doctrine aud the practice thereof, or verily not at all. But now it is wonder, what extreame passion hath driuen them to this deniall. Surely they see that it conuinceth flatly (as indeed it doth,) their peremptorie separation: And therefore, rather then they would seeme to haue erred in so mayne a poinct: wee cannot but thinke that meere desperatnes, hath driuen them to it. Neuertheless, all this we leaue to the Lorde, with the iudgment thereof, who hath the hearts of all men in his hand: not only to search the secrets; but also to turne and dispose them, euen as it pleaseth him.

* Mai. Barrow. Mai. Penry. Mai. Iohnson.

F. IOHNSON his Defence of his 9. Reason.

VNto our Nineth Reason aforesaide, he answereth: That it is a Fallacy: separate from such: Ergo separate wholy. *But howe shewes he any fallacie to be in our Reason? Hee bids vs see his answere aboue to our third Exception, also his answeres to the two last Reasons of all. Well we haue seene them, and finde nothing there but against him self, as there hath bene shewed. So this Reason then, as the rest also, still standes vnanswered, and stronge against them. And that we may not doubt, but him selfe also seeth it to be so, how soeuer he seemeth to pleade to the contrarie before: therefore nowe he graunteth it (and so yeeldes vs the cause) both in expresse wordes, and by not defending the 17. poinctes of false doctrine, wherewith they were charged, neither their owne Cannons, Articles, Iniunctions, &c. alleadged against them. In expresse wordes, whē he sayth,* they graunt, that so farr foorth as they holde otherwise then trueth, so farre we may and ought to separat from them. *Loe here what the euidence of the trueth (against which they haue struggeled so longe) hath now at length drawne from them. The trueth is mighty, and preuayleth. But he addeth,* that we must not separate from them any further, then as before: not wholy or absoluteiy: and so saieth he, the Apostle "here meaneth. *Well, but let us here knowe what this mā him self meaneth hereby: If he meane that we must not for their other defectiō forsake the truthes which they holde. We answere that we doe it not, as him selfe knoweth: and in this sence also his meaning should come nothing neare the Apostles meaning. Them selues say they haue separated from the Papists:*

" 1. Tim. 3. 3.

ee As that ther is a God: that there is three persons in the Godhead: that Iesus Christ is the Sauiour of ỹ worlde: that God made heauen and earth: that there shalbe a resurrection of the iust and vniust.

pists: yet he neither can nor will say, that they haue forsaken the "truthes which the papistes held, notwithstanding that they haue made separation from them. But if he meane, that because of the truthes which they professe, therefore we should not separate from them: then First he contradicteth him selfe, hauing graunted that we must separate from them, so far foorth as they hold otherwise then trueth. Secondly, he condemneth their owne practize in their separation from the Papistes, notwithstanding the truthes they professe. Thirdly, in this sence also his meaning should come nothing neare the Apostles meaning. Thus therefore it is euident, both that there is no fallacie in our reason, but that it is plaine and forceable against them: And moreouer, that he hath directly in expresse wordes yeelded vs the cause, and acknowledged our separation from their assemblies, ministerie, worship, &c. And as he doeth this in expresse wordes, so also he sheweth it in deed, in that he leaueth without all defence (as vnlawfull and to be separated from) their Ministerie, Worship, and Gouernement Ecclesiasticall, the 17. poincts of false doctrine obiected against them, and their Canons, Articles, Iniunctions, &c. mentioned both here, and more particularly in the First and Second Reasons going before: which thing we wish the Reader well to obserue. And because we are fallen againe into mention of the 17. poinctes of false doctrine, to the end that the Reader may yet more see the deceitfulnes of his dealing and insufficiencie of all his answeres heere and before: therefore it shall not bee yrkesome to sett downe here before the Readers, those 17. poinctes of false doctrine aforesaide, specially seeing they are but short. They are these as followeth.

Poinctes of false doctrine deliuered and spread abroad by the Writings, Sermons, and practise of the forward Preachers of the Parish assemblies of England: with answeres to the same.

1 *That though the open notorious obstinate offenders be partakers of the Sacramentes, yet neither the Sacramentes, nor the people that ioyne with them, are defiled thereby.* Which doctrine is contrarie to the trueth of God in these scriptures, 1 *Cor.* 10,17. *Hag.* 2.14,15. 1 *Cor.* 5. 6. and 10. 28. 2 *Cor.* 6.15,18. *Gal.* 5.9. *Mat.* 18.8,9,15,16,17,18,19. *Exod.* 12.43. *Leuit.* 15.4,5,6,7,31. and 11.24. and 23,45,46. and 19.17. *Num.* 5.2,3. and 19.21,22. *Iosua* 11.12. *Ezra* 6.21.22. *Ier.* 3.1.

2 *That the planting or reforming of Christes Church must tarrie for the Ciuill magistrate, and may not otherwise be brought in by the word & spirite of God in the mouthes of his weakest seruantes, except they haue authoritie from earthlie Princes:* Which doctrine is against the Kinglie power of Christ, and these scriptures, *Mat*, 28.18. *Actes* 3.23. 1 *Cor.* 1.

27.

27. *Pſal.* 2.6,9,10,12. *Eſai* 9.6,7. *Zach.* 4.6. *and* 6.12.13. *Dan.* 2.44 *and* 7.27. *and* 9.25. *Mich.* 5.7. *Mat.* 28.20. 1 *Cor.* 14.27. *with* 1 *Theſ.* 4. 8. *Phil.* 2.6,12. 1 *Tim.* 6.13,14,15. *Reue.* 1.5. *and* 14.12. *and* 17.14. *&* 19 16. *and* 20.4.

3 *That the true viſible Church of Chriſt is not a ſeparated companie of righteouſe men and women, from the Idolaters and open wicked of the world, but may conſiſt of all ſortes of people good & bad:* Which doctrine is contrarie to the paterne of Chriſts Church, throughout all the ſcriptures. *Gen.* 4.26. *with* 6.2. *Exod.* 4.22,23. *Leuit.* 10.10. *and* 20.24,25,26 *Pſal.* 24.3,4. *Ezra* 6.21. 2 *Chron.* 11.13,16. *Nehem.* 10.28. *Eze.* 22.26. *with* 44.23. *Zeph.* 3.4. *Mat.* 3.10,12. *Act.* 2.40,41,42. *and* 19,9. *Rom.* 12.1,8. 2 *Cor.* 6.17,18. 1 *Pet.* 2.9,10. *Reu.* 14.9,12. *and* 18.4. *and* 21.27 *and* 22.14,15, *&c.*

4 *That they may mainteyne this error of their confuſed order and mixture of all ſortes of perſons togeather, they peruert the Parable of the tares, Mat.* 13.24. *teaching that all are the Church:* Which doctrine is againſt the trueth of the ſcriptures, yea againſt our Sauiours owne interpretation in the 38. verſe, who teacheth, that by the field is meant (not the Church) but the world, in which his Church is militãt. And as therin there is the good ſeede, the righteous, the Children of the Kingdome: So there are alſo tares, hipocrites, the childrẽ of the wicked, who as they are often eſpied in this life, by the righteous ſeruauntes of God, ſo ſhall they in that great day be perfectlie ſeuered from the godly by the Angels of God, verſe 38.43. This their doctrine alſo is againſt the heauenlie orders mentioned, *Matt.* 18. 8, 9, 15, 16, 17. 1 *Corint.* 1. 26. 29. *Actes* 2.40.41,47. *and* 5.26,27,28. *and* 19,9. *and* 5.4,7. 2 *Cor.* 6. 17,18. *Leuit.* 18:29. 1 *Tim.* 6.5. 2 *Iohn verſe* 6. 11. *Reuel.* 2. *and* 3. *and* 14.9. 12 *and* 18.4. *and* 20.4.

5 *That the people may tollerate and ioyne with open iniquitie in the Church, vntill by the Magiſtrate it be redreſſed:* which doctrine is contrary to the ſcriptures, 2 *Cor.* 10.4,5. *Mat.* 28.21. *Acts.* 2. 40. *&* 3.23 *and* 4.19. *and* 9.26. *and* 19.9. 1 *Tim.* 5.22. *Deu.* 5.32.

6 *That the guiftes of interpretation and application of the Scriptures are a ſufficient and lawfull calling to the miniſterie, &c.* Which doctrine is both falſe and Anabaptiſticall, contrarie to the ſcriptures, *Heb.* 5. 4. *Rom.* 12.6,7,8. *Leuit.* 22.25. *Ezek.* 44.8.9, *&c. Num.* 1. 51. *and* 3.10,38 *and* 16.40. *and* 18.2 3,4. *Act.* 1.20.26. *and* 14.23. *and* 13.2.3.

7 *That the Church may yeelde obedience vnto other lawes, cannons, and traditions, officers and offices, then God hath preſcribed in his Couenant.* Which doctrine is contrarie to *Gen.* 49.10. *Mal.* 6.24. *Iohn* 10, 4,5. *Reu.* 14.4. *and* 22, 18,19. *Heb.* 3,1, *&c:*

8 *That the Church may read other mens wordes vppon a booke, and offer*

offer them vp to God as their owne prayers and ſacrifices in the publique Aſſemblies: Which doctrine is contrarie to the ſcriptures, *Eſai* 29. 13, 14. *Rom.* 8. 26. 1 *Cor.* 14. 15. *Mat.* 6. 6. 9. *and* 15. 9. *Mar.* 7. 7. *Ephe.* 4. 7, 8. 1 *Pet.* 2. 5.

9 *That it is lawfull to ioyne with the Miniſterie of dumb and Idoll Prieſts, and to receiue the Sacramentes at their handes:* Which doctrine is contrarie to, *Mal.* 1. 14. *and* 7. 19 *and* 24. 24, 25. *Iohn.* 10. 1. 5. *Num.* 16, 5, 9, 24, 26, 39, 40, *&c.* 1 *Tim.* 6. 5. 2 *Iohn verſe* 6. 11

10 *That it is lawfull for a Miniſter of Chriſt, to ceaſe preaching, & forſake his flock, at the Commaundement of a Lord Biſhop:* Which doctrine is contrarie to, 1 *Cor.* 9. 16. *Eſay* 62. 4, 6, 7. *Ier.* 48. 10. *Zach.* 11. 17. *Iohn* 10. 11, 12, 13, *Actes* 4. 18, 19, 20, *and* 5. 29. *Amos* 7. 12, 13, 14, 15. 2 *Tim.* 4. 2.

11 *That the Church of Chriſt hath not alwayes power to binde and looſe, to receiue in, and to caſt out by the Keyes of the Kingdome:* Which doctrine is contrarie to *Mat.* 18. 17, 18. *Pſal.* 149. 9. 1 *Cor.* 5. 4, 5. 12, *Num.* 5, 2, 3.

12 *That it is lawfull for the people of God to heare notorious falſe prophetes in their Miniſterie:* Which doctrine is contrarie to *Deut.* 18. 15. *Mat.* 17. 5. *and* 7. 15. 2 *Iohn verſe* 10. 11. 1 *Cor.* 10, 18. *Gala.* 1, 8, 9, *Reuel.* 14 9, 10, 11. *and* 18. 4 *Iohn* 10. 96.

13 *That it is the Church and houſe of God, the body and kingdome of Chriſt, where he reigneth not by his own Ordinances & Officers, but the higheſt Eccleſiaſticall authoritie is in the handes of ſtrange Lordes, and Antichriſtian Prelates, who alſo gouerne by Romiſhe Cannons, and not according to the lawes of Chriſtes Teſtament:* Which doctrine and practiſe is condemned by *Luke* 19. 14, 27. *Iohn* 15. 14. *Rom.* 6. 16. *Luke* 22. 25, 26. 1 *Pet.* 3. 2 *Theſ.* 2 3. 4 *Iohn* 3. 35. 36. *Reuel.* 9. 3. *and* 14. 9. 10. 11 *and* 19. 14. 15.

14 *That there may be a preſcript Leiturgie and ſett fourme of ſeruice in the Church, framed by man:* which doctrine is contrarie to *Deut.* 5. 8. *Eſai* 29. 13, 14. *Mat.* 15. 9. *and* 7. 6. 7. *Gal.* 3. 25. *Iohn* 4. 24. *Rom.* 8. 26. 27. *Ephe.* 4. 7. 8.

15 *That an Antichriſtian Prelate, notwithſtanding his dignitie (as it is called) ſpirituall, may be a Ciuill Magiſtrate, and obeyed of the people as their lawfull gouernour,* Which doctrine is contrarie to *Rom.* 13. 1, *&c. Mat.* 20. 25, 26. *Mar.* 10. 42, 43. *Luke* 22. 25, 26. *Reuel.* 14. 9, 10, 11. *and* 17. 18.

16 *That men may giue the titles of Chriſt Jeſus vnto theſe ſonnes of men, and his mortall enemies, to call them their Arch and Lord Biſhops,*

Reue-

Reuerend Fathers, &c. Which doctrine is contrarie to *Mat.* 23. 8, 9, 10. *Esai* 42. 8. *and* 48. 11. *Pro.* 17. 15. *and* 24. 24. *Esai* 5. 20. 2 *Cor.* 6. 14. 17.

17 *That it is lawfull for a Minister of Christ to be mainteyned in his ministerie, by the goods of wicked and vnbeleeuers, by Iewish and Popishe tythes and offeringes:* Which doctrine is contrarie to *Prou.* 27. 26, 27. 1 *Cor.* 9. 13, 14. *Phil.* 4. 10. 18. *Gal.* 6. 6. *Rom.* 15. 27. *Heb.* 7. 12.

These are the 17. *poinctes which were mentioned before in the proofe of this reason: which the aduersarie hath left altogeather vnanswered, as he hath done also their owne Cannons, Articles, and Iniunctions: which are to be seene in their printed bookes. And thus is he driuen againe & againe whether he will or not, to yeeld vs the cause.*

That which he addeth in the next place, of their not wholy denying the trueth, nor fundamentally, nor obstinately, peruersly, and desperatlie any parte thereof, *is answered before in the defence of our second Exception, and of our sixt and seauenth Reasons.*

Nowe, when he next saith, That they are not herein like those Iewes (Act. 19. 9.) whom Paule separated from, which he did not from all other Iewes, Actes 13, 14. and 16, 3: and 21, 23, 24, 26. and 3. 1. *Firste wee aske, What if they be not in all respectes like vnto those Iewes, are they not therefore to be separated from? So in deed he would conclude in this place, But then let him tell vs, if Corah, Dathan and Abiram, the Apostate Iewes vnder Ieroboam, the Corinthians, Papistes, &c: might not alleadge some particular exception, wherein they were not like to those Iewes, Act.* 19. *Might not therefore separatiō be made from these? The scripture teacheth otherwise, Numb.* 16. 25, 26. 2 *Chrō.* 11. 14. 2 *Cor.* 6. 17. *Reu.* 18. 4 *Secondly, cōsider the place it selfe (Act.* 19. 9.) *& cōpare it with their estate & practise in England, & see if there be not now as great and iust cause to separate from thē, as frō the other. Are not these now hardned against the trueth? Let their writings against it, their imprisonning, banishing, and killing for it, giue euidence. Doe they not disobey it? Let their constitution and practize be witnesse. Speake they not euill of the way of God before the multitude? Let the Sermons of their Ministers in the pulpit, & the speaches of the Prelates in their Courtes beare record: Therefore saith that* " *Scripture (Actes* 19) *they are to be departed and separated from. Wherevnto also may be added in this case that which Peter saith Act.* 2. *Saue your selues from this froward generation. Thirdly were he obiecteth* That Paule did not separate frō all the other Iewes, as he did from these, *Acts* 19. and sheweth it by *Act.* 13. 14. *and* 16. 3. *&* 21. 23, 24. 26. *&* 3. 1 *we answer, that the Apostles had good and iust cause so to doe. For firste the Iewes* * *were the people of God, separated from the world, and set in*

" Actes 19. 9. Actes 2. 40.

* Rom. 9. 4. Leuit. 20. 22, 24, 26. Luk. 1. 6. 8. &c.

the true waand order of God. Secondly, * Christ commaunded the Apostles, when he sent them to preach his Gospell, throughout the worlde, that they should first preach it to the Iewes. Thirdlie, the Iewes ministerie & ceremonies being the ordinances of God him selfe, and giuen in writing by Moses the man of God, " were therefore nowe, when they should cease, to be buried with honor. These things considered, we see the Apostles had iust cause so to doe, as they did in those places mentioned: But what is this to the assemblies of England, which neuer yet were separated from the world, nor set in the way and order of Christ, but stande in the * confusion and defection of Antichrist, whose ministerie also and worshippe, were neuer the ordinances of God, But * taken out of the whores Cup of Babilon, for which likewise God neuer gaue Comaundement to goe vnto them, but to " departe from them, as being daughters of the greate Babilon that mother of whoredomes and abominations of the earth. Againe euen from those Iewes, notwithstanding the reasons aforesaid, yet when they put from them the trueth, and would not receyue it, the Apostles departed and separated thē selues, yea and shooke off the dust of their feete against them, teaching others to doe so likewise, Actes 13.46,51. and 18.6.& 28. 25,26,27,28. and 20.40. and 19.8,9.

* Luke 24.47. Act. 1.8. and 13.46.

" Act. 15. 21. and 21.30, 21 22,23, 24,25. Heb. 8.5,13. & 9.1,&c.

* Reue. 13.16, 17. and 18 2. 2 The. 2.3,4,8

* Reue. 17.2,4 and 18.3. and 9.3. &c.

" Reue. 18. 4. with 17.9. 1 Tim. 6,3,5.

To that of Maister Cranmer, Ridley, &c is answered before. And hetherto of their generall Assumption, which was this: That the whole doctrine as it is professed and publiquely practised by lawe in Englande, is sufficient to make a particular man a true Christian. Which wee haue shewed to be vntrue, both by the Exceptions and Reasons aforesaid, which still stande firme against them, as is manifest by this our defence.

Touching the conclusion:

And now let the godly Reader (trying all things by the Word of trueth) iudge, whether we or they holde Paradoxes.

Touching that he saith of the reformed Churches, he is deceyued, if he thinke they allowe their present estate and church constitution. Both their publique profession and practise witnesse the contrarie: as wee haue declared at large in " other treatises, which yet remayne vnanswered, wherevnto we referre the Reader in this behalfe.

" In y answers of Ma. Carthwrights reasons: of Maist. Hildersams letter, &c.

Where he sayth, That we our selues heretofore haue acknowledged and professed it, (to wit their general Assumption aforesaid to be true) he is also deceyued therein: we haue alway * testified the contrarie, both by our profession and practise, and were and are therefore cast into prison, appointed to exile, and put to death: besides many other iniuries & grieuances inflicted vpon vs for this verie cause. In deed we haue acknowledged and doe acknowledge, that they professe diuers excellent truthes, but

* You maie speake it with shame enough

that

that the whole doctrine, as it is publiquelie professed and practized by law in England, doeth make them in that estate true Christians, neuer anie of vs (that we know of) did once acknowledge. And therfore till he shew vs the contrarie, we must needes thinke that he falsely burtheneth vs all, and specially such of vs, as he hath mentioned here in particular.

To that which he next addeth of the Martirs in Queene Maries dayes is answered already in the defence of our Seconde Exception and First Reason, wherevnto may be added for more euidēce of the trueth, the particular speaches & testimonies of the holy Martirs themselues, both then and in former tymes.

As of Maister Bradford, who "speaking of the dayes before Queene Marie) saide, The tyme was, when the Pope was out of England, but not all popery. And moreouer, "That the scripture knoweth not any difference betweene Bishops and Ministers, which men call Priestes. And that the scripture speaking of Bishops, can not be vnderstood of Bishops that minister not, but lord it.

"Actes & monuments 2. vo. in his conference w Peter Henth.

"In his firste speach with D. Harpsfielde, Archdeacon.

Also of Maister Hooper, who held and "published, that a Bishop should be Bishop but of one Citie: and that till the Magistrates bring them to this point, it shalbe as possible to heare a Bishop wade, godly and simply through the scripture in case of Religion, as to driue a Cammell through the eye of a needle. And agayne he sayth: The primitiue Church had not such Bishops as be nowe a dayes. And againe, What blindnesse (sayth he) is there befell in the world, that can not see this palpable yll, that our Mother the holy Church had at the beginning, such Bishops, as did preach many godly Sermons in lesse time then our Bishops horses bee a brideling.

"Hooper on the eight commandment.

And John Bale, an exile for the testimonie of Jesu, writing vpon the Reuelation, *affirmeth moreouer, That the names of Blasphemy written vpon the Beastes head (Reuel. 13. and 17.) are none other then the proud glittering titles, wherewith they garnish their vsurped authoritie, to make it seeme glorious to the worlde, hauing within them conteyned the great misterie of iniquitie. What other els (saith he also) is Pope, Cardinall, Metropolitan, Primate, Archbishop, Diocean, Archdeacon, Officiall, Chauncelour, Commissarie, Deane, Prebend, Parsons, Vicar, and such like, but very names of blasphemie? For offices they are not appointed by the holy Ghost, nor yet once mentioned in the scriptures. This Iohn Bale held and published. Then which, what can be more full and euident against them?

*Bale in his booke called The Image of both churches vpon Reu. 13. 1. and 17. 3.

And againe writing vpon the 14. chapter of the Reuelation, he hath these wordes: To receyue the beastes marke in their foreheads & hands,

In Image of both churches vpō Reu. 14. 9

is both to agree to ſuch decrees, traditions, lawes, conſtitutions, actes, and proclamations, as they vnder thoſe titles, haue made, onely for their own couetouſnes and pompe, and neither for the glorie of God, nor yet for the right maintenance of the Chriſtian cõmon wealth: And alſo to be ſworn to the ſame, to ſubſcribe to it, to giue counſell or ayde to it, to mainteyne it by learning, to miniſter in it, to execute vnder it, to accuſe, puniſhe, and put to death for it, or to thinke it lawfull and godly, with ſuch like.

" Ibid. vpon Reuel. 16. 12.

And " afterward vpon the 16. of the Reuelation, expounding the drying vp of the waters of Euphrates to be this, That the welthy Popes poſſeſſions and pleaſurs of the Clergy (their falſe ſeates once knowen) are and ſhalbe cleerly taken away from them: He ſaith Moreouer, In * England by the Goſpell preaching haue many of theſe waters bene dried vp in the ſuppreſſion of the monaſteries, prioryes, couents, and Friers houſes, yet are not all thinges brought vnto Chriſts cleare inſtitution. A cincere Chriſtian-order cannot yet be ſeene there. And a great cauſe why. For all is not yet dried vp there. The Biſhops reigne ſtill in aſmuch vaine glorious pompe, and with as many Heatheniſh obſeruations, as euer they did, As cruelly harted and as bloody minded are they yet, as euer they were afore. No miſchiefe vnſought to holde in the waters. Marke howe " Winchester, Durham, Yorke, London, and Lyncolne, worke (let vs alſo now adde Canterburie) with ſuch other pleaſantlie diſpoſed Euphratynes: But be of good comfort, & pray in the meane time. For the holy Ghoſt promiſeth heere, that they ſhall wither away withall that the heauenly Father hath not planted. All which generation will the Lords breth cõſume, &c.

*Marke alſo by this of what time & eſtate hee ſpeaketh: euen of ſuch, when the Goſpell was preached, the Monaſteries ſuppreſſed.

" He meaneth the Prelates of theſe Seas.

Likewiſe may be ſhewed by the teſtimonie of others in former tymes, as of Iohn Wickliffe, who * helde and affirmed: That Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Archdeacons, Officialls, Deanes, Cannons, were diſciples of Antichriſt.

* Actes & Monumen. 4 edi. 2. vol. pa. 150.

In like manner of William Swinderby, who * ſaid that what Pope, Cardinal, Biſhop, Prelate or Prieſt, in manner of liuing, or teachching, or lawes making, contrarie to Chriſts liuing & his lawes, or any other ground put in ruling of the Church of Chriſt, but by Chriſt and his lawes, is very Antichriſt, aduerſarie to Ieſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

* Ibid. pag. 36. 8. b.

Alſo Syr Iohn old Caſtle Lord Cobham who " held & affirmed, that the Biſhops, Prieſtes, Prelates, and Monkes, were the body of the great Antichriſt: And that the poſſeſſions and Lordſhips of the Clergy, were the venime of Iudas ſhed into the Church.

" Ibid. pag. 562. b. & 563.

Likewiſe Iohn * Cladon burnt in Smithfield, held & profeſſed, that the Archbiſhops, & Biſhops, ſpeaking indifferently, are the ſeates of the beaſt Antichriſt, when he ſitteth in them and reigneth aboue other people in the darke Caues of errors and hereſies. Moreouer that the Biſhops licence

* Ibid. pag. 639. b.

for a mã to preach the worde of God, is the true character of the beast, that is, Antichrist.

Finally William "Tindall and Iohn* Frith, held and publisſed, That Archb. Lordb. Archdeacons, Deanes, Officialls, Parſons, Vicars, and the reſt of that ſort, are the diſciples of Antichriſt, yea very Antichriſtes themſelues.

" In his treatiſes called the obedience of a chriſtian man, and the praeſiſe of Prelats.

* In his Preface before his Antytheſis betweene Chriſt and the Pope.

Theſe are the ſpeeches and teſtimonies of the holy Martirs in former ages, whereunto diuerſe other ſuch like might bee added. But theſe may ſuffice for the matter in hand. And now compare with theſe thinges alleadged, the publique profeſſion & practiſe of England euen as it is by law at this day, and ſee whether their owñ proofes bee not ſo many witniſſes againſt themſelues. But if it were ſo, that the reformed Churches, wee our ſelues, and the Martirs of former time, had geuen allowance of their preſent eſtate & Church conſtitution, what would this help thē, when all the word of God condemneth thē, as we haue ſhewed in our Reaſons aforeſaid & defence therof. Whereunto (if they will ſtill iuſtifie their eſtate) wee require direct anſwer from poinct to poinct, and that from the ſcriptures, which only can ſtabliſh the conſcince.

Now furthermore, that the truth it ſelfe, and their eſtate may better appeare what it is, as alſo that they may not turne away or obſcure the truth by their ſubtill ſhiftes and euaſions, as their manner is: We will therefore propound vnto them a few queſtions concerning the poinctes now in controuerſie in this land, deſiring their playne and ſincere anſwers, thereunto by the word of God, as they will anſwer him in his great day.

The queſtions are theſe.

1 Whether the Lord Ieſus Chriſt haue by his laſt Teſtament geuen vnto and ſet in his Church ſufficient ordinary 1. Offices, with their 2. Callings, 3. Workes, and 4. Maintenance for the adminiſtration of his holy things, and for the ſufficient ordinary inſtruction, guidance and ſeruice of his Church to the end of the world, or no.

2 Whether the Offices of Paſtors, Teachers, Elders, Deacons, and helpers, be thoſe offices appincted by Chriſt in his laſt Teſtament as aforeſaid.. Or whether the preſent eccleſiaſticall Offices of Archbiſhops, Lordbiſhops, Suffragans, Deanes, Prebendaries, Cannons, Petticannos, Goſpellers, Piſtlers, Virgirers Queriſters, Organ-players, Prieſts, Deacons or, halfe Prieſtes, Archdeacons, Doctors of diuinitie, Batchelers of diuinity, Chaplyns or Houſe-prieſtes, Commiſſaries, Officialls, Proctors, Apparitors; Parſons, Vicars, Curates, Vagrant or Mercinary preachers, Churchwardens, Sidemen, Clerkes, Sextons, and the reſt now had in theſe Cathe-

drall and parishionall assemblies be those offices appointed by Christ in his last Testament as is aforesaid, or no.

3 Whether the Callinges and entraunce into these Ecclesiasticall offices last aforesaid, their Administration, and Maintenance, nowe had and receiued in England, be the manner of calling, administration, & maintenaunce which Christ hath appointed for the offices of his church aboue named, or no.

4 Whether euery true visible church of Christ be not a company of people called and separated out from the world by the worde of God, and ioyned togeather in fellowship of the Gospell, by voluntary profession of the faith and obedince of Christ? And whether the present ecclesiasticall assemblies of this Land be such: or no.

5 Whether the Sacraments (beeing seales of the righteousnes which is by faith) may be deliuered to any other then to the faithfull and their seed, or in any other ministery and manner then is appointed by Iesus Christ the Apostle and high Priest of our profession? And whether they bee not otherwise administred in the Cathedrall and parishionall assemblies of England at this day.

6 Whether their booke of Common prayer with the Feastes, Fasts, and Holydayes, stinted prayers, and Leiturgy prescribed therein, and vsed in these assemblies, be the true worship of God commaunded in his word, or the deuise or inuention of man, for Gods worship and seruice.

7 Whether all people and Churches without exception bee not bound in Religion, only to receiue and submit vnto that ministerie, worship, and order, which Christ as Lord and King, hath giuen and appoynted to his Church? Or whether in Religion, any may receiue or ioyne vnto, another ministery, worship and order deuised by man, for the seruice of God? And consequently, whether they which ioyne to the present ecclesiasticall ministerie, worship, and order of these cathedrall and parishionall assemblies, can bee assured by the word of God, that they ioyne vnto the former appointed by Christ, and not to the latter deuised by man, euen the man of sinne, for the worship and seruice of God.

Vnto these questions and the particulers thereof, for the causes aforesaid, we desire their direct answer, with proofes of their answers from the scriptures, according to which word if they speake not as wee said before, so we say againe, with the "Prophet Esay: It is because there is no light in them. or Esa. 8. 20.

And now to conclude, whereas this man being not able to answer our Reasons (as hath bene declared) yet would in the ende of his writting, fasten vpon vs some strange passion, yea and meere desperatnes, for separa-

parating from them, and answering of them as we haue done. *We leaue it the godly and discrete Reader to iudge by that which hath bene said on both parts, whether it bee not themselues which are taken with a strange passion, and driuen thereunto by meere desperatnes, when as to mainteyne their estate they will haue the scriptures to fall, (as hath bene* * *seene in their answeres before,) yea and exalt the Church, and Magistrate aboue Christ himselfe, euen flesh and blood aboue God, blessed for euer. But for this and all their vnrighteous dealing against the truth and people of God, we leaue them to the Lord, who searcheth the hearts, & tryeth the raynes, euen to giue euery man according to his wayes, and according to the frute of his workes. That is, to them that by continuance in weldoing seeke glorie, and honor, and immortalitie, eternall life: But vnto them that are contentious: and disobey the trueth, and obey vnrighteousnes, indignation, and wrath, Ier. 17. 10. with Rom. 2. 6, 7, 8.*

* See the answer to our second Exceptiō and 7. Reason, &c.

H. IACOB his 2. Reply to the 9. Reason.

IN this your defence of the last Reason, *you mislike that I say it is a fallacy: and you say I shew none.* Marke what I say, Euery one of your Reasons, I say euery one, is a very proper fallacy, and an artificiall parte of Sophisterie, as by my seuerall answers to them may appeare. Your First Reason is called in ỹ scholes Fallacia ab eo quod est secundum quid ad simpliciter proving a thing to be simply, by that which is but after a sort. The Second is the very same. The Thirde *Fallacia equiuocationis*, A fallacie of Ambiguity. The Fourth is the very same. The Fift is *petitio principij*, a begging of the question. The Sixth the very same fallacie that was in the First and Second Reasons. The Seauenth, Eight, and Ninth, haue all the *Fallacy of Equiuocation*, and if you will, the same with that, in your First, Second and Sixt Reasons, also.

Further, where you say, *that here I graunt you the cause*, it is very absurd. The Apostle 1 Tim. 6. 3, 4, 5. saying, separate frō such, hath a two fould sence, Either such as teach otherwise then the trueth fundamentally, and then separate wholly: Or not fundamentally, but erring only in poincts lesse then the foundation: and theise diuersely also, Either presumpteously obstinately, and of a desparate conscience: and then if that apeare, separate from such wholly: Or els, erring in simplicitie and of ouersight, and former preiudice, from such, separate not wholly, but only from the very error or errors, in no wise from their Christian communion and societie, seeing theise are true Christians.

Seing therefore our corruptions of the Prælacie, and Ceremonies, be of these latter sort: which thing hetherto, you haue not nor cannot ouerthrowe, (and withall you must vtterly ouerthrowe Maist. Cranmer and the rest of the Martirs their Christianitie like wise): Therefore wee in England, by the grace of God, are still true Christians: and you ought

so

ſo to acknowledge vs, as you will anſwer vnto God: All which you may doe, and yet touch no parte of our Eccleſiaſticall corruptions at all, to giue allowance vnto them: And in all this, there is no contradiction with my ſelfe, it is but your diſtempered conceipt, that ſeemeth contrarie. Neither is our abſolute departure from the Papiſts, hereby anie whit impeached. Wee haue iuſtlie forſaken them cleane, becauſe by their very profeſſion & doctrine, wee cannot eſteeme them true Chriſtians, neither in caſe of ſaluation, while they ſo remaine, but indeed very Antichriſtes, as the ſcripture proueth. Which thing alſo if you ſay of vs, you ſay falſlie: it is our preſent queſtion, and you doe not proue it, nor euer can doe.

As for your .17. poincts of falſe doctrine, which you moſt falſly lay to our chardge, what haue I to doe with them? I liſt not to meddle at this preſent, but with that which wee haue in hand, namely to iuſtifie, that our publike booke of Articles of Religion (ſo farre forth as that it erreth not fundamentally,) conteyneth ſufficient to make a true Chriſtian: Againſt the which, hetherto you haue brought nothing worth the hearing, as we haue ſeene.

As it doth not.

After, *you would proue vs to be like thoſe Iewes Act.19.9, Whom Paul ſeparated from:* But without all good reaſon. They were not ſo many but they were eaſely certified of the truth that Paul preached: but how infinitly many moe are there in this land, that know nothing of this controuerſie. 2. Secondly Paul was better able to conuince them by the ſcriptures, and did more effectually, and apparantly, then you doe (or can) our whole Realme. 3. Thirdly how many learned are there in this lande, that haue many probable and ſeeming reaſons, and alleadge them, & publiſh them for the Prælacie againſt you: and are vnanſwered. And yet will you ſay they are cõuicted, and thoſe infinite others depending on them? I ſay conuicted aſwell as thoſe Iewes? What if theſe ſpeake euill of that which you hold for truth, but they hold to be errors and ſchiſme? Are they all, yea all the Land therefore aboliſhed from Chriſt? Might not all this at leaſt, be ſaid of the whole eſtate of the Iewes in Chriſtes time, and after aſwell, yet they ceaſed not to bee Churches? why then are you ſo partiall againſt vs?

Laſtly, *you would ſhew Reaſons why the Apoſtles wholy ſeparated not from the Iewes Synagogues after Chriſt, Act.13.14. &c.* Which you will in no wiſe haue to ſerue vs. But alas for all your Exceptions againſt vs, you haue neuer a reaſon but one, and that is *petitio principij, That wee were neuer ſeparated from the world, nor ſet in the way & order of Chriſt, but in the confuſion and defection of Antichriſt, whoſe Miniſterie, &c. Were neuer the ordinances of God, &c.* This is but crauing the whole queſtion. And I haue refuted theſe quarelles in a ſhort writing (hereafter following) about the compariſon of the Miniſterie with Mariage, which yet you haue no leyſure to anſwer, this whole three yeares togeather, and vpwarde.

And

And further you doe not shew any vtter and absolute separation from the whole Church of the Iewes a great while after Christ: but the contrarie is seene Act. 21. 23, 24, 26. though from some one or two synagogues they separated after full experience of ther obstinate and malitious resistance of the truth, which we deny not.

Touching the Conclusion.

IN the conclusion of my former Replie, to proue your vtter separation from vs a Paradox: First I alleadged all the reformed Churches: For who knoweth not, but they all hold Communion with vs as Churches of God? yet you dare either deny this, or vtterlie peruert it. Yow tell vs *of your Answers to Maister Cartwright and Maister Hildersham that are vnanswered.* If they by like to this your answer here, verely they doe wisely in yeelding silence to such friuolus and wandring wordes.

Secondly I alleadged your selues to haue acknowledged heretofore, That our publique doctrine allowed, would and did make many of vs true Christians. *Yow too shamefully deny it. And say you are for Witnessing against it, imprisoned, banished, &c.* Whereto I answere, that if for these things you are troubled, I know none can pittie you. And because you say none of you euer acknowledged it, I will therefore repeat your owne wordes.

Mr. BARROW (in his last answer in writing to Mr. Gifford, intituled, A few obseruations to the reader of Mr. Giff. last Reply: Sect. 4.) saith thus:

The next calumniations whereby Mr Gifford indeuoreth to bring vs into hatred with the whole Lande, is, That we condemne all the persons both men and women of England, which are not of our minde, and pluck them vp as tares: wherein me thinkes he doeth vs open wrong, if not against his owne cõscience, yet against our expresse writings euery where, &c. Haue we not commended the faith of the Englishe Martirs, & deemed them saued, notwithstanding the false offices and great corruptions in the worship they exercised, not doubting but the mercy of God, through their syncere faith to Iesus Christ extended and superabonnded aboue all their sinnes seene and vnseene. And what nowe should let, that we should not haue the same hope, where the same pretious faith in synceritie & simplicitie is found? So that they neither neglect to search out the trueth, nor despise the trueth when they see it, &c.

Afterwards in the same Section.

The faithfull seruants of Christ (denying the whole constitution and gouernment of this Church of England) may iustlie deny the people whilest they remayne in that constitution to bee members of a true constituted Church, yet hereby not condemne them with any such peremptory sentence as Maister Gifford suggesteth, to cut them of from Gods election, or from Christ. Nota. From Christ.

Mr. PENRIE (in his confession of faith, published in writing a litle before his death,) saith thus.

" *The trueth of doctrine touching the holy Trinitie, touching the Natures and Offices of Christe, Justifying faith, Sacramentes, Eternall life, and the rest, established by her Maisties Lawes, and professed by her selfe, their Honors, and such as haue knowledge in the Assemblies of this lande: I acknowledge from my heart to be such, as if I mainteyned not the vnitie, and helde not the communion, of the same doctrine with them in these poinctes, I could not possibly be saued: For out of the Communion of the true profession, which her Maiestie hath established in these and the like truthes, there is no hope of salvation left: But ioyne notwithding with the publique worship in the assemblies of this Land, I dare not, for the former causes.*

" *I doe moreouer willingly confesse, That many, both of the Teachers, & also of the Professors within these Parish assemblies, haue so embraced this trueth of doctrine, established and professed in this Land, as the Lord of his infinite goodnes, hath graũted thē the fauour, to* shew outwardly, *many tokens, whereby (in regard of the Lordes election) I professe before men and Angells, that I iudge them to be members of that body* where-of the Sonne of God Christ Iesus is the head. *Onely herein the Lord be mercifull vnto them, (as to my self in regard of my sinnes:) That they are not vnder that* outward *forme of gouernement that Christ hath left, &c.*

" *And in his examination before Maister Fanshaw, lately published by your selues in print, he confesseth the Churches of England to be the true Churches of Christ.*

And what say you, Maister Iohnson? Haue you not affirmed this thing your selfe, to me, and to Maister Philips, namely touching your owne selfe, when you were of vs, *That then you doubted not, but you were a true regenerate Christian.* By vertue of what doctrine? By extraordinarie reuelation? Nay, but by our publique doctrine of our Church, when you stoode and continued a publique Minister of the same. If you beleued so of your selfe, (and that truely) what letteth but you may beleeue the like of many Thousands nowe?

Further where you say, *my applying of the Martirs, is answered before.* Let the Reader iudge. You shewe here, that *some of them misliked the Hyerarchie.* But it maketh stronger against you, seeing for all that, they them selues refused not to communicate, and partake with them then, as true Christians: as Hoper, Bale, Bradford, &c.

After where you say: *though the reformed Churches, your selues, and the Martirs, haue thought otherwise then you nowe doe: yet all this is no*

sound

ſound proofe againſt you. Yes in deed, that nowe you holde a *Paradox*, thoſe witneſſes are ſufficient for that: wherevnto may be added, the whole Churches iudgement and practize, with all the auncient learned Fathers theſe 1300. or 1400. yeres *Chriſoſtom. Epiphanius, Nazianzen. Hyerom. Auſten. Ambroſe, &c.* They all haue thought, that vnder the Prelacie, and humane ceremonies, men may be true Chriſtians. Then theſe witneſſes are ſufficient, that your deniall hereof, is a ſtrange and vnuſuall opinion, that is, a *Paradox*.

Finally to trie vs, *you propound a many of queſtions.* But I leaue all this ſuperfluous ſtuffe to your ſelfe to be pondered. Firſt let vs cleare this preſent queſtion, and your Reaſons here about: Till then, wee haue no leaſure to meddle further. The Lord of his mercy open your eyes to ſee your extremitie, whereby you doe greatlie hinder, not helpe the trueth, which you would ſeeme to ſuffer for. That you may indeed ſhewe your ſelf as becometh a Chriſtian Paſtor, not impoſſible to erre, but no louer of error *μὴ φιλονικῶν ἀλλὰ φιλαλήθης, not regarding your own, but the praiſe of Chriſt in all things.

*Not a ſtriuer for victorie, but a louer of truth.

AMEN.

FINIS

A SHORT TREATISE CONCERNING THE TRVENES OF A PASTORALL CALLING IN *PASTORS MADE BY* PRÆLATES.

Againſt the Reaſons and Obiections of Maiſter *FRANCIS IOHNSON*, with others of the ſeparation, commonly called *Browniſtes.*

1599.

An Argument, ſhewing the trunes of a Paſtorall calling in Paſtors made by Prelates: Taken from a familiar compariſon, gathered out of the confeſſions of Maiſter Iohnſon and others of the ſeparation aforeſaid.

(∴)

The Argument of Compariſon is this

'AS a couple of ignorant people not contracting, but meaning to marry, and yet thinking that vnleſſe a Prieſt marry them, their marriage is nothing, wheras indeed their publique accepting each of other maketh the marriage: Now beeing married, (though "vnlawfully) by a Prieſt, yet their marriage is true and lawfull notwithſtanding.

" As themſelues hold.

EVen ſo, a Chriſtian people, meaning to haue a ſufficient man to their Paſtor, yet thinking, that vnleſſe a Prelate doe make him, he is no Paſtor at all, neither can be theirs. Notwithſtanding, he being made a Paſtor, (though "vnlawfully) by the Prelate; yet, by their mutuall accepting and ioyning togeather, hee is now verely a Paſtor, yea their Paſtor, true and lawfull.

" As they alſo doe acknowledge.

H. IACOB.

Againſt

Againſt the ſaid Argument, were brought Seauen Reaſons by Maiſter Iohnſon and others: which doe hereafter follow, togeather with Maiſter Iacobs Replies to the ſame.

REASON. I.

F.Iohnſ. *FIrſt, infidels, idolaters, prophane and godles perſons, may marry togeather, with conſent, and choyſe of each other, notwithſtanding their prophanenes, and their marriadge is therein lawfull. But it ſtandeth not ſo with the choyſe of Miniſters in the Church, For 1. prophane and godleſſe perſons (ſuch as theſe aſſemblies conſiſt of) 2. neuer rightly gathered togeather according to Gods holy ordinance, 3. remayning in ſubiection and bondage to their falſe and Antichriſtian officers & courts, conſiſting of all ſorts of people, &c. are not capable of chuſing, or ioyning vnto a true Miniſter in this eſtate (as infidels may marry in the ſame eſtate). Therefore the compariſon will not hould, neither is ſuch choice of a Miniſter by ſuch people lawfull.*

But theſe aſſemblies conſiſt of ſuch people, &c. Ergo, &c.

H.Iacob THe ſtrength of this Reaſon ſtandeth in theſe laſt wordes: *But theſe aſſemblies conſiſt of ſuch people, 1. prophane & godles perſons, 2. neuer rightly gathered togither according Gods ordinance, 3. remayning in ſubiection and bondage to their falſe and Antichriſtian officers & courts: Ergo, &c.* Theſe three accuſations auaile nothing at all.

Accuſation. 1. The firſt Accuſation is from our queſtion, for we ſpeake of a *Chriſtian* people, but he, of aſſemblies cõſiſting of prophane and godles perſons. If he ſay, our aſſemblies all & wholy are ſuch: That is falſe. If he ſay, ſome are: Of them we ſpeake not. If he ſay in all & euery one of our aſſemblies there are ſome, yea many open prophane and godles perſons. 1. It is too bold a ſaying, & without knowledge to ſpeak ſo of all. 2. If it were true, yet it were falſe to ſaye, our aſſemblies conſiſt of ſuch, or to thinke that whole companies of Chriſtians by ſuch commixtures are made vnholy, prophane, and godles: which is contrary to theſe ſcriptures, Mat. 23, 2, 3. Luke 2. 21, 22. & 1. 6. Act. 21. 23, 26. 1 Sam. 2. 17. and cap. 1. verſe 3. 9. Reuel. 2. 20, 21, and 3. 1, 4. 1 Cor. 3. 3. Gal. 3. 1, 2. & 4. 11, 16. and 5. 4. 9.

Accuſation. 2. The ſecond Accuſation [*that our aſſemblies were neuer rightly gathered togeather at the firſt according to Gods ordinance.*] I denie it: eſpecially touching many famous Congregations in the Land, where the goſpell was not vnknowen before the Queenes commaundiment came to vrge thẽ to receyue this doctrine. And if the maner of receyuing it then, in thoſe hard and doubtfull times and hazardous beginnings, were not

so perfect nor so exact, as should haue bene, yet we may see by the exam-
ple of " *Hezechias*, and * *Manasses*, and † *Iosias* reformations, That God im-
puteth it not to such godly and zealous restorers, the pillers and ground
of the trueth in those dayes. If you say, the vntaught people then sud-
denly receyuing the gospell by commandement, not by hearing, could
not beleeue at the first, though they professed, and therefore at the firste
were no true Christians nor Churches? I answer, 1. Though many re-
ceiued the Gospell for the commandements sake, yet who can say, That
nowe they all generally wanted all knowledge, and all faith? The word
then hauing bene in many places taught, very many bookes scattered,
much conference, daily consultations and disputations vsed, and the
blood of the Martirs hauing preached so loud, and so lately before. 2. It
was not so sudden. There was " more then halfe a yeare, for the people
to heare, learne, and consider, before the commandement came. So that
it can not be counted meere force and compulsiō, that at the beginning
of our Queenes reigne, brought vs to the trueth? 3 I would know, They
condemne not (I hope) all reformation commanded and compelled by
the Magistrate, 2 Chro. 34.32,33. and 33.16. and 15.13. Seeing there-
fore, the assemblies thus openly, & aduisedly, submitted to the proclai-
med trueth, who seeth not, but they cōfessed therein their former errors,
and professed their present faith, and vndertooke a newe life from that
which before they led, though happely not so formallie, nor so perfectly
as were to haue bene wished.

" 2 Chro 30. 17,18,19,20.
* 2 Chro. 33. 15,16,17.
† Zepha. 1. 4, 5. and 3. 1. Ier. 3. 6. &c. and 4. 1. &c. and 5. 1. &c.

" From November the 17 till Midsomer following.

Obiection. *But they receiued all togeather, Papistes, Atheistes, ignorant men, & all dissolute liuers, into one communion and fellowship.*

Answer. Indeed all, who after this aduizement and notice take, submitted to & receyued this doctrine, these were all receyued in. And therefore no open professed Papistes, Athistes, nor other Heretikes. As for ignorant men, it is not possible but many will scape among the rest, in so great and so generall reformation of a publike state. And so questionles it was in Hezechias, Manasses, and Iosias reformation. 2. Chron. which we noted before. The notorious, dissolute, & wicked, some were reclaimed, all vn-dertook another profession, & a new appearance of Christianitie. And no doubt the like is to be thought of these, as before I obserued touch-ing the ignorant men. Now all this was done, not intollerablie doubt-lesse, though I graunt weakely & corruptly. And very like euen to your owne receiuing into your Church at this time: nay more tollerable and more lawfull then yours: who to furnish onely one congregation, haue receiued many knowne bad men, and very ignorant: yea and still retaine men full of contention, & bitter strife, 1 Cor. 3. 3. In a word this I answer:

That which disanulleth not a Church gathered and settled, That disanulleth it not in the gathering and beginning.

But such mixtures doe not disanull a Church gathered and setled, as appeareth aboue in the scriptures quoted against the First Accusatiō, Mat 23. Luke 2. &c.

Therfore such mixtures did not disanull our Churches then in their beginning.

The

The Third Accusation is, [*our Assemblies remayne in obedience to the false Antichristian officers, &c.*] Let this be our generall sinne: yet there is diuersitie of sinnes. All are not of like detestation before God, nor of like cõsequence against vs. I say not that any sinnes are veniall: but I say, All sinnes by their nature are mortal, yet doe they not al alike abolish vs from Christ, nor depriue vs of the glory of God. Now this sinne of outward church orders is not of the most heynous, nor extreamest disobedience. There are sinnes against the *foundation, and there are sinnes that stande *with the foundation: ibid.* wherein men liuing and dying ignorantly without perticular repẽtance, may be saued. Such were the sinnes of the Iewish church and estate in Christes time, and after, as some thinke, euen till their Temple and Citie were destroyed, though they did personally hate and persecute Christ. Such also was the sinne of the auncient declyning Bishops, *Epiphanius, Augustine, Chrisostom, Leo of Rome, &c.* No lesse was in ours of late *Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, &c.* in King Edward dayes: and no greater is now in ours presently, especially touching our Churches, & Ministers too, *generally*. If you say, we are all conuicted nowe, and sinne against our cõsciẽces, as they did not in those times: It is vtterly false, & a palpable vntrueth. Whosoeuer knoweth any thing in our church estate *generally*, must needs see it, that this poinct touching the Hyerarchy, is not acknowledged euen of ignorãce in a thousand to one: many holding (& not of the simplest) this present gouernement to be th'only true & right kinde: but all men almost, to be indifferent, & lawful: very few indeed, & scarse to be found, I see it to be meerly nought, or as you terme it, wicked & intollerable. And in King Edwards time, whosoeuer considereth, shall finde, that the godly learned Protestãts then, were not vtterly ignorant of this poinct of reformation, and yet sinned not against their conscience in bearing with the times, neither were abolished from Christ. And surely touching the Iewes, they were all generally more conuicted then, that Iesus was the Christ, then we are now, that the Prelacie is of Antichrist: & yet they remayned a church stil, because generally indeed, they were not plainly conuicted. Thus thẽ this our sinne is *no way *fundamentall*, it destroyeth not faith & Christianity in our whole assemblies: Therfore they remaine Christian people still, as I affirmed: not all godles & prophane, as he vncharitably speaketh. O beware of rash and hasty iudging, euen of one brother, Rom. 14. 3, 4, 13, how much more of such & so many whole assemblies professing Christ in Englãd? Woe be vnto him which curseth, where God curseth not, Num. 23. 8. As also indeed that blesseth, where God blesseth not. We desire you not to blesse vs in our euil, but we warne you, not to curse vs in our good: which indeed turneth vs not to any furtherance, but to a great hinderance and stumbling block, stopping vs frõ that sincerity which els we should drawe nearer vnto. Blessed is he that iudgeth wisely (that is without affection & partialitie) euen of him that is despised. Better it is and more Christianlike, euen to offende in too much compassion and patience (especially towardes so many hundreth thousands, by whom we know nought saue good in this poinct) then to

Accusation 3.

* 1 Cor. 15. 3, 3. 4. Rõ. 4. 25. 1 Cor. 3. 10, 11 12, 13, 14.

** Beza in Acts 15. 20.

* See the 2. sortes of fundamental sinnes, in the 2. Reply to your 7. Reason before, pag. 48.

offend in too much rigor, and ſeueritie, & vniuſt anger, Mat. 5. 22. Howbeit this were not indeed to offend, as hath bene aboue ſhewed. And briefly in twoo words, thus I conclude it farther, that.

That faith & religiõ taught in the booke of Articles publiſhed 1562. maketh the people that beleeue and obey the ſame, true Chriſtians: ſuch as ſo liuing and dying may be ſaued.

But our Church doeth ſo holde that faith,

Therefore they are true Chriſtians.

The Propoſition onely is doubted. I had thought none ſo deſperate as to deny it: but lately I vnderſtand, they haue denyed it. Howbeit for anſwer, I referre them, partly to that which here hath bene ſaid before, and eſpeciallie to that which is replied to their Anſwer in the former Treatiſe: which being well weighed, I doubt not but all indifferent, and Chriſtian mindes will acknowledge, our publique church aſſemblies in England to be true Chriſtians.

REASON. II.

F. Iohnſ. *SEcondly the Prieſt doth not celebrate or pronounce any marriage Without the married firſt giue their conſent.*

But the Prelats make Miniſters Without & before the peoples conſent.

Therefore the compariſon holdeth not.

H. Iacob FIrſt it is very vaine to make this any matter, viz. the peoples cõſenting either before or after the Prelats ordeyning. For whether before or after, it is *in nature and value* all one: They in their ignorãce hauing reſpect *only to the Prelats act*. And if it were ſo, that the Prieſt ſhould ſometymes marie a couple, the Maide being meerly enforced, and denying conſent, yet not ſtriuing nor reſiſting: and a while after ſhall willingly agree and like: Out of queſtion there is now true wedlock betweene them. Euen ſo the caſe is betwixt the Church and the Miniſter. 2 But what will they except here againſt thoſe Paſtors amõgſt vs, that were firſt choſen by the people, they firſt profeſſing their conſent, and are after inſtituted & inducted by the Prælat. Many are thus called amongſt vs: & the moſt haue the peoples conſent euen togeather at their firſt inducting: at leaſt wiſe they haue ſoone after, by the peoples *ſubmitting* & *maintayning* them euen preſently. 3 Laſtly in a word, where he ſaith "*the Prelats make Miniſters Without and before the peoples conſent*. We "affirme, that they *make not* the Paſtor at all *indeed* and *in truth*; but only *ſuppoſedly*. It is the Churches conſent that maketh him *truly*, whether before or after the Biſhop, that ſkylleth not. If any thinke Impoſition of hands to be ſimplie neceſſarie to the being of a Miniſter: that is alſo an error, & cannot be proued.

" Beza in Act 14. 23. Fenner againſt Bridges, Pag. 148.

REASON. III.

F. Iohnſ. *THirdly the people cannot chuſe their Miniſter vnleſſe the Prelate either before or after make him Miniſter.*

But a couple may chuſe each other Whether the Prieſt will giue his conſent or no. Therefore, &c.

We

WE deny your saying, *the people cannot chuse.* They can chuse, They haue power in Christ, as being Christians, though they know not their right therein. The ignorance of this simply, doth not cut vs off from Christ, nor from this holy priuiledge: no more then the blind Papistes haue lost their right & power of marrying togeather without a Priest, because they are ignorant of it. 2. Againe where he saieth, *But a couple may chuse each other whether the Priest will marry them or no:* Let him marke: That we speake of blind Papists that thinke that the Priest is the whole absolute and necessarie marriagemaker. If he say, euen such haue right and power to marry, though they be farre from knowing it, and farther from practizing; Then let him graunt the like in chusing a Minister, to our Christians: for so the comparison importeth, Els if he meane those words of others that be mē of knowledge, Then he fighteth with his shadow: he toucheth not our question. H. Iacob

REASON. IIII.

IF any that by the word of God are not capable of marrying togeather (as brother & sister, &c.) doe notwithstanding consent to take each other for man and wife: yet are they not therefore lawfull man and wife. F. Iohns.

So if a people and some man that by the word of God cannot chuse one another as Pastor and Church in their estate (such as now is in this land) doe notwithstanding consent to take each other: yet are they not therefore lawfull Pastor and Church.

THis is wholy presumed and from the Question also, Like to the first Reason, and hath the same answer as is made to the first accusation there. He reasoneth against people not capable of a Pastor; And vve speake of true Christians vvhich are alvvayes capable. He doth ill therfore in comparing this action to mariage betvvene brother & sister; vvho indeed cannot marry. Happely he may likelyer compare it to a couple that haue liued both of them vvantonly: Aftervvards they marrie togeather, and this marriage it selfe they vse not soberly, nor temperatly. Hovvbeit for all this, I professe these tvvo are truly man and vvife notvvithstanding: Novv euen so our Churches and Ministers, &c. H. Iacob

REASON. V.

THe Priests ioyning of the parties doeth not make them man and wife at all, but only the parties mutuall consent. F. Iohns.

But contrarily, in the present ecclesiasticall cōstitution of England, the Prelats ordination maketh the minister, and not the peoples choyse at all.

THe Second Proposition vve here flatly deny. It is answvered in our last vvords against the 2. Reason. H. Iacob

REA-

REASON. VI.

F. Iohns. *IF a woman consent to a man that is another womans husband, they are not therefore man and wife.*

So if a people consent to a false Minister, they are not therefore true Church and Minister.

H. Iacob THis is answered as before in the Fourth Reason. It carrieth some likelyhood indeed, and some reason against *Pluralities*, but nothing any further.

REASON. VII.

F. Iohns. *IF when a man and woman give consent each to other, the man doe afterwards give his body to another, and so commit adultery: Then is the marriage knot broken.*

So, if after a people have chosen a man to be their Minister, hee give himself to another & a false Ministerie, and so commit spirituall whoredome: Then is the former knot broken.

H. Iacob THe taking of orders from a Prælate, after consent given to a Minister by a people, is not like adultery in mariage: especially, where both Pastor and people are simply ignorant of that error. Therefore that disanulleth not, as adultery doth the wedlock. So this Reason is much like to the last before, and the answer not vnlike to that of the Fourth Reason likewise. For

That which at the First maketh not vncapable: That same afterwards doeth not dissolue.

But this error maketh not christians vncapable at the first: as there is shewed, and in the Third chieflie:

Therefore neither can it dissolue afterwards the Couenant betweene the Pastor and the people.

This last Treatise, hath remayned in their hands, these Three yeeres and more, vnanswered.

FINIS.